

## **An Explanation of the Saying of The Biased-Partisans:**

**Murji'ah with the Rulers, Khawaarij with the Du'aat, Raafidah with the  
Islamic Groups, Qadariyyah with the Infidels**

**And What It Contains of [Wicked] Falsehoods  
[And Fanciful Hallucinations]**

---

### **BENEFIT**

Abul-Fadl Abaas Ibn Mansoor as-Saksakee (683H), in his powerful Sunni, Salafi treatise said concerning Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah,

"And every sect has called them with a name that is not in agreement with the true reality, out of envy of them and as a fabrication against them. And they ascribed to them (Ahl us-Sunnah) that which they did not hold as their doctrine. So the Qadariyyah labelled them "the Mujbirah". The Murji'ah called them "the Shakkaakiyyah" (the doubters). The Raafidah called them "the Naasibah". The Jahmiyyah called them "the Mushabbihah". The Ash'ariyyah called them "the Mujassimah". The Ghaaliyyah called them "the Hashawiyyah" (the worthless ones). The Baatiniyyah called them "the Muswaddah". The Mansooriyyah (a sect of the Khawaarij), and they are the associates of Abdullaah Ibn Zaid, labelled them as Murji'ah due to their saying that the one who abandons the prayer, without rejecting its obligation, is a Muslim based upon the correct view in the madhhab. And they (the Mansooriyyah) say that this saying of their's (i.e. that of Ahl us-Sunnah) leads to the saying that Imaan is speech without action. Yet all of this is incorrect regarding them. Rather, they are the Firqat al-Haadiyyah al-Mahdiyyah (the Guiding and Guided Sect) and its creed is the correct creed and the clear and manifest Imaan (faith), that with which the Qur'aan was revealed and which has come in the Sunnah, and that which the Ulamaa of the Ummah from Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah have agreed upon."

Al-Burhaan Fee Ma'rifat Aqaa'idi Ahl il-Adyaan, (pp.65-66)

## Contents

<b>Reasons for Writing “Ma’naa Qawl il-Hizbiyyeen...”</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>The Beginnings of the Fitnah</b>	<b>6</b>
Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen On This Accusation	6
The Slandorous Source	7
Qutubite Polemic Against Shaikh Rabee’	7
Blind Hizbiyyah Spreads	9
The Stickiness Factor	9
How To Belittle The Affair Of The Innovators	9
Bolshevite Rehearsals	10
In The Land Of The Takfiris, The Best Aggrandiser Gains Imaamship	11
Enter The Trojan Horse of Ahl ul-Bid’ah, Al-Muwaazanah	11
The Unfortunate Doctor And His Mansoori Kharijite Thesis	12
Add The Jins ul-‘Amal Theorem To That	13
The Intellectual Perspective And Objective	15
The Practical Perspective	16
The Severest Fitnah	16
“Khawaarij” With The Scholars??	16
Enter Shurocracy	17
Splitting And Differing Is Absolute Goodness, Unity Upon Sunnah And Salafiyyah	
Is Destruction(!)	18
Haakimiyyah Is The Merchandise Of True Salafiyyah	19
The Inevitable Split	20
In Summary	21
<b>The Intended Meanings Behind The Sentence: Murji’ah with the Rulers, Khawaarij with the Du’aat, Raafidah with the Islamic Groups, Qadariyyah with the Infidels</b>	<b>23</b>
Murji’ah with the Rulers	23
Khawaarij with the Du’aat	24
Raafidah with the Islamic Groups	26
Qadariyyah with the Jews, Christians and Infidels	27
Closing Remarks	29
<b>She Accused Me With Her Own Iniquities</b>	<b>30</b>
Murji’ah with the Innovators, Mockers of the Prophets and Revilers of the Caliphs	30
Khawarij with the Sinners, the General Body of Muslims, its Rulers and Nation	
States	33
Raafidah Towards the Messengers of Allaah and their Companions	34
Qadariyyah Towards the Divine and Prophetic Methodology in Calling to Allaah and the Establishment of His Authority upon the Earth	36
Summary	40
<b>A Dialogue with Salim Morgan</b>	<b>41</b>
Introduction	41
The Opening of the Scandal	43
The Inter-Salafi Fitnah	44
Followers of Imaam al-Albaani and Shaikh Muqbil	44
Violence Came From the Salafis? The “Defeatist, Lenient” Ones?	46

Buckets of Fantasies. Qutubi and Revolutionary Fantasies That Is. ....	50
The Scandal Reaches Its Peak.....	53
Between the Salafi and Qutubi Manhaj.....	55
Hidden and Implicit Takfir .....	59
Mockery and Belittlement of the Scholars .....	61
The Ancient Claim .....	62
The Scandal Matures.....	63
An Important Point About al-Haakimiyyah and Tawheed.....	64
Rectification of the Affairs.....	67
The Call to Khurooj - Rebellion.....	71
Going Round in Circles.....	73
Being Justly Balanced .....	74
Ignorance of the Salafi Manhaj and the Way of the Muhadditheen: Warning the Common Folk .....	76
True Takfeeris?! .....	78
The Bulk of the Muslim Ummah Is Deviant?.....	79
Lets Close Early.....	81
Beware of The Warm-Fuzzy Thing .....	83
<b>Important Lessons for Every Salafi, Athari .....</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>Closing Remarks.....</b>	<b>95</b>

## Foreword

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

O you who believe! Fear Allaah as He should be feared, and die not except in a state of Islaam (as Muslims) with complete submission to Allaah. (Aali Imraan 3:103)

O mankind! Be dutiful to your Lord, Who created you from a single person (Adam), and from him (Adam) He created his wife [Hawwa (Eve)], and from them both He created many men and women and fear Allaah through Whom you demand your mutual (rights), and (do not cut the relations of) the wombs (kinship). Surely, Allaah is Ever an All-Watcher over you. (An-Nisaa 4:1)

O you who believe! Keep your duty to Allaah and fear Him, and speak (always) the truth. He will direct you to do righteous good deeds and will forgive you your sins. And whosoever obeys Allaah and His Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) he has indeed achieved a great achievement (i.e. he will be saved from the Hell-fire and made to enter Paradise). (Al-Ahzaab 33:70-71)

To proceed, verily the best speech is the Book of Allaah and the best of guidance is the guidance of Muhammad (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). And the worst of affairs are the newly invented matters, every newly-invented matter is an innovation, every innovation is misguidance and all misguidance is in the Hellfire.

## **Reasons for Writing “Ma’naa Qawl il-Hizbiyyeen...”**

In contemporary Takfiri circles and private meetings this particular phrase, “Murji’ah with the Rulers, Khawaarij with the Callers, Raafidah with the Islamic groups, Qadariyyah with the Infidels” is often repeated as a mockery and sarcasm of Ahl us-Sunnah, As-haabul-Athar, the Salafis, Atharis. And this legacy of reviling Ahl us-Sunnah is an ancient one, which has been inherited by the Ahl ul-Ahwaa of the later times from those of the earlier times.

Following the deaths of the two Imaams of the Sunnah, the Establishers of Tawheed and the Sunnah and the Destroyers of Bid’ah, Imaam al-Albaani and Imaam Ibn Baaz, the Ahl ul-Bid’ah were given a new lease of life. And the perceptive Sunni, Salafi, Athari, will have noticed a considerable increase in activity within Bid’iyy circles, and amongst its thinkers and propounders, whether amongst the pure Khawaarij, the New Qutubiyyah, Surooriyyah, or other than them from the sect of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and the Jihadis, Takfiris.

Amongst the greatest of trials to have afflicted Ahl us-Sunnah in the more recent times is the accusation of Irjaa’ that has been thrust at them from the direction of neo-Kharijite thinkers and theorists – those affected by the da’wah and ideology of Sayyid Qutb. In particular, from the direction of a) the unfortunate doctor who neither knew the reality of Irjaa’ and nor that of Imaam al-Albaani, Safar al-Hawaali b) the hardcore Qutubi who recently made the Mocker of Moosaa (alaihis-salaam), the Mukaffir of Banu Umayyah and the Reviler of Uthmaan (radiallahu anhu) as “an Imaam of Guidance”, that is Salman al-Awdah and c) the Innovator of Hizbiyyah and the Democracy of the Infidels, Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, as well as d) Mohammad Qutb, the brother and acting minister of Sayyid Qutb.

It is from the direction of these ones that the accusation of Irjaa’ emanated and which was aimed at making Ahl us-Sunnah and its Imaams and Mashaayikh to fall in the eyes of the Ummah. As a result they bridged the gap between themselves and the Khawaarij, the “Revolutionary Takfiris” as Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen referred to them, and so we saw that as a result of the efforts of all of those mentioned above, the Salafis became the true enemies – and so all of them, the hardcore Khawaarij, the Revolutionary Takfiris, Surooris, Qutubis, all the groups of Hizbiyyah became united in assaulting the Salafis, accusing them of being “Murji’ah”, “Neo-Salafis”, “Deniers of Jihaad”, “Supporters of the Thrones of the Tyrants” and so on. This is what has actually happened as a result of the effects of the da’wah of Safar, Salman and Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaliq. This is where the fitnah originated – when they opposed the Salafi Manhaj, as Imaam al-Albaani noted about them.

Whereas there had previously been a distinct and clear line between Ahl us-Sunnah and the Khawaarij, Jihaadis, Takfeeris, Qutubis and so on there now appeared confusion and fine line was no longer there. Many amongst the Khawaarij, Takfiris, Jihaadis and Qutubis claimed to be Salafis and immediately saw something in the da’wah of Safar, Salman and

Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq which supported what they were already upon of takfir, khurooj and enmity towards the Salafis, and their accusing them of all sorts slanders and lies. In this manner, confusion arose amongst Ahl us-Sunnah and many unsuspecting ones become confused and bewildered – and in their confusion thought they remained upon Sunnah and Salafiyyah by adopting the heretical modes of thinking of those who claimed Sunnah and Salafiyyah but were in reality pushing Bid'ah, Qutubiyyah and Khaarijiyyah.

And for this reason we find many in the West showing the same pattern of events in their behaviour with the Salafis as was shown by the biased partisans in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and other Gulf states, the likes of Safar and Salman and Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, when the Mashaayikh of Ahl us-Sunnah caught them red-handed and exposed their scandal. They were met in return with accusations of being “spies”, “agents”, “paid workers”, “sedition-makers” and so on. And this mindset was transferred to many an unsuspecting Muslim who unfortunately was not free from elements of hizbiyyah and affectations to the ways of thinking of contemporary political ideologies and agendas, such as those of Qutb and Mawdoodi.

And all of this gave birth to the kinds of slanders that we will be addressing in this discourse. The current work consists of three parts:

- 1) An introduction to the beginnings of the fitnah that caused turmoil in the ranks of Ahl us-Sunnah.
- 2) A discussion of the phrase “Murji’ah with the Rulers, Khawaarij with the Callers, Raafidah with the Islamic groups, Qadariyyah with the Infidels”
- 3) A reply to some recent comments made by Salim Morgan.

And it is hoped that all of this gives further insight to Ahl us-Sunnah about the machinations of Ahl ul-Ahwaa, their nature and condition and their angles of approach and their well-known sayings by which they can be distinguished, they ploys and stratagems, and the way hawaa (desire) toys with them and leads them from one extreme to another.

## The Beginnings of the Fitnah

In recent times, the emergence and spread of Qutubiyah and Khaarijiyyah, has led to the preponderance and spread of this accusation against Ahl us-Sunnah (of their being Murji'ah, Khawaarij, Raafidah and Qadariyyah), particularly from those affected by the da'wah of Mohammad Suroor, Mohammad Qutb, Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, Abdur-Razzaaq ash-Shaayjee, Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah and others from amongst the main theoreticians of Qutubism – who were labelled collectively as “The Khawaarij of the Era” by the Imaam and Muhaddith, al-Albaani – something that became a thorn in the throat of the sympathisers and loyalists, who to this day, **have not left their state of oblivious denial and madness (junoon) on account of this fatwaa of Imaam al-Albaani.**

### Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen On This Accusation

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen spoke over a year and a half ago about this accusation against Ahl us-Sunnah that they are “Murji'ah with the Rulers, Khawaarij with the Du'aat, Qadariyyah with the Jews and Raafidah with the Islamic Groups”. He explained that is “slander, and making insults by name-calling” and that it is the way of those who wish to cause commotion and strife in the land, by way of their open rejection of the evils coming from the Rulers, all in the name of “rectification”.

Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Ma'rabi had previously asked Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen in his meeting with him, as occurs on the cassette “As'ilat Abil-Hasan al-Misri al-Ma'rabi lish-Shaikhain Ibn Baz wa Ibn Uthaimen”, the following question, “Our Shaikh, may Allaah protect you, some of the students of knowledge who see others that are fearful of and withhold (out of wara', piety) from making unrestricted takfir of the rulers (i.e. without tafseel), so when they see words from others which are in opposition to what has occurred amongst some of the du'aat of today, from another angle, they say about them, “You are Murji'ah with the Rulers, Khawaarij with the Du'aat, Qadariyyah with the Jews”, meaning that you submit yourselves to everything that comes from the Jews and you have submitted yourselves to them, and you do not wish or intend to change anything that has come from the Jews (of plotting and planning etc.). And likewise they say, “Rawaafid with the Islamic Groups”, when they call them to enter into their Islamic groups, but they reply that this is hizbiyyah (partisanship) and this is splitting, we will not enter into it, however we call to the Qur'aan and the Sunnah and we co-operate with everyone upon piety and righteousness, without any ascriptions and membership to parties and to these slogans and mottos. So in return they reply to them in this manner. And I had read a fatwaa of yours in this regard, so perhaps if you make mention of it as well, if Allaah wills, on this cassette, then perhaps Allaah will bring about benefit through it for the one who hears it?”

The Shaikh answered, “I hate that this [slander] should occur from one set of brothers to another. And I consider this to be slander, and making insults by name-calling. Those ones (who are accused) do not like to speak against the rulers on top of the pulpits, since that does not bring about any rectification, as is evident. However, this does not mean that they justify everything that occurs from the Rulers. They actually consider that some of what

occurs from the Rulers is an error and some of it is correct. However, this does not mean that we now stand on top of the minbar and in the midst of the societies and the lectures, or in specific (private) gatherings – since in all of this there is not benefit. The intent of the one who wishes to give advice is to bring about real correction in the leaders, not just releasing one's anger, seeking vengeance. So whoever intended rectification of the leaders, then it is necessary for him to tread upon the path in which there is true rectification. As for the one who merely wishes to vent his anger and to quench his thirst and to treat his disease – then the affair of such of one to Allaah the Mighty and Majestic, and we are not in need at this moment to give examples of those who wish to rectify the Rulers, yet they stand on top of the pulpits and revile and abuse them, in front of all of those in the gatherings and lectures<sup>1</sup>. We do not wish to mention any examples of this because the reality bears witness (to what already occurs from the likes of these). (Cassette: “As’ilat Abil-Hasan al-Misri al-Ma’rabi lish-Shaikhain Ibn Baz wa Ibn Uthaimeen”).

### **The Slandorous Source**

This great slander was first initiated by the Arch-Liar and Delusionist, Abdur-Razzaaq ash-Shayjee, one who has been labelled “an idiot (safeeh)” by the Imaams of al-Jarh wat-Ta’deel such as Shaikh Muqbil.

Most of the neo-Kharijite polemic against Ahl us-Sunnah is taken from the idiot mentioned above –we refer to him as an idiot since the Muhadditheen, the Imaams of al-Jarh wat-Ta’deel have characterised him in this manner, and hence it is befitting that we adhere to their terminology. So this idiot made numerous fabrications against those who were a thorn in his throat and a preventative barrier to his deviant da’wah and methodology. This led him to lie against the likes of Imaam Ibn Baaz<sup>2</sup>, Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan<sup>3</sup>, Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee and others – and not only lie but to make great the lie. For more details of his lies, one can refer to NDV100001-NDV100009.

### **Qutubite Polemic Against Shaikh Rabee’**

The Qutubite polemic was directed, in particular, to Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee, the Imaam of al-Jarh wat-Ta’deel and the Ibn Ma’een of the Era, as he had been described by the likes of Imaam al-Albaani and Shaikh Muhammad al-Bannaa – both from the veteran Salafi Ulamaa. Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee had launched the Qutubi Inquisition in order to purge the hijacking of Salafiyyah by the likes of Salman al-Awdah and Safar al-Hawali, those who under the influence of Kharijite figureheads such as Muhammad Suroor and

---

<sup>1</sup> This was the well-trodden path of Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah who would take the faxes of Muhammad al-Mis’ari and then read them out to the people. They would also take to the pulpit and make and open display of their open rejection. Rather, they would argue the case for open rejection by anyone as has been explained elsewhere (refer to “Intermediate Qutubism” GRV070004).

<sup>2</sup> Such as ash-Shayjee’s claim that the advice given by Imaam Ibn Baaz to the du’aat was intended specifically for Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee. Refer to NDV100005.

<sup>3</sup> Such as ash-Shayjee’s claim that Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan allows entry into parliamentary elections and activities and the likes. Refer to NDV100009.



Muhammad Qutb, had introduced the books of *bid'ah* and *zandaqah* to the Salafi youth. The books of Sayyid Qutb became the revivalist spring and foundation for what they called the "*Sahwah*" (Awakening), and Sayyid Qutb – the Mockers of the Prophet Moosaa (alaihis-salaam), the caller to Socialism, the Mukaffir of Banu Umayyah, the Reviler of Uthmaan bin 'Affaan (radiallaahu anhu) – became one of the "Imaams of Guidance" in the words of al-Awdah, something that he persists upon till this day, aiding and assisting, in all of that, in the demolition of Islaam – as stated by Fudail Ibn Iyaad (radiallaahu anhu), who said, "Whichever man someone comes to asking for advice and he directs him to an innovator then he has acted deceitfully towards Islam, and beware of entering upon a person of innovation since they prevent from the truth." (al-Laalikaa'ee no. 261).

When the Ibn Ma'een of the Era – together with other notables from the Salafi Mashaayikh - saw this great deceit and treachery, and what was behind it of the Kharijite agenda and the Bolshevik Rehearsal<sup>4</sup>, and how this same ugly pattern of events had led to the deaths of hundreds of thousands in other Muslims lands in contemporary times, after the books of Sayyid Qutb had been introduced therein<sup>5</sup> – they stood to perform the due obligation.

In light of these efforts, the Qutubites then made many lies and fabrications in order to hide themselves, since they had been exposed and they had come to know that their true realities and their agendas had been uncovered. So they began to make accusations against the Salafi Mashaayikh, claiming that they were "spies", "paid-workers", "defenders of the thrones of the tyrants" and other such vicious and cowardly lies, in order to win over the youth and to hide the true realities from the youth.

Enter the phrase "Murji'ah with the Rulers, Khawaarij with the Du'aat, Qadariyyah with the Jews and Raafidah with the Islamic Groups". This was the slogan and motto of ash-Shayijee and it was then transferred to all the various parts of the Earth by the Qutubists, the Biased Partisans and others from the wandering strayers. Ash-Shayijee also coined the phrase "Salafiyyah Jadeedah (New Salafiyyah, that is Neo-Salafis)", attempting to revile and demolish the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah and to ridicule those who adhered to it with their molars. He claimed that "true" Salafiyyah had been hijacked by a band of false-claimants, meaning Ahl us-Sunnah, the Atharis, Salafis, As-haabul-Hadeeth.

---

<sup>4</sup> Refer to "Readings in Intermediate Qutubism" GRV070004.

<sup>5</sup> As Yusuf al-Qaradawi, one of the Innovators of Ikhwaan himself observed, "And it was in this period that the books of the Shaheed, Sayyid Qutb appeared, the books that **represented his final thoughts** (in ideology, before his death). Those which **justified the takfir of (whole) societies... the breaking of all sentimental attachments to society, breaking off ties with others, and the announcement of a destructive jihad against the whole of mankind. And showing contempt against the du'at who call for lenience and softness, accusing them of idiocy, and being defeatist.** [Saying all of this], in front of the western civilisation. He made this manifest, in the most clear manner in the tafsir, "**Fee Zilaal il-Qur'aan**", in the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition and in '**Ma'alim fit-Tariq**' (Milestones), and the bulk of it is taken from 'Zilal' and 'Al-Islam wa Mushkilat al-Hadaarah' and others..." (Priorities of the Islamic Movement p.110)

## **Blind Hizbiyyah Spreads**

Both of these phrases were used by Qutubite theoreticians, figureheads, supporters, loyalists and blind-followers alike. Chief amongst them in the West were the likes of Ali at-Timimi<sup>6</sup>, Idris Palmer, Abu Muntasir, Salim Morgan and many others whose intense hatred of the methodology of the Imaams of Ahl us-Sunnah, their Muhadditheen and their followers – the Salafis, the Atharis, Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah, As-haabul-Athar became apparent in recent times.

Many of those who were actually ignorant of the true realities and the underlying issues fell into hizbiyyah (partisanship) and then began to find fault with the Salafi Mashaayikh, claiming that they were “harsh”, “rude”, “arrogant”, “back-biters” and so on – merely because they stood to perform that which was obligatory for them. Similar insults were directed to those who had adhered to the knowledge-based views of the Senior Imaams and Mashaayikh in those issues which had been opposed by the Qutubite theoreticians and thinkers, the issues which Imaam al-Albaani alluded to in his famous fatwaa about “the Khawaarij of the Era” when he said, “...they have opposed many of the issues of the methodology of the Salaf”. So Ahl us-Sunnah adhered to the Sunnah, and the guidance of its Imaams, and vehemently defended it against the machinations of those who opposed it.

## **The Stickiness Factor**

Further, many of the pure Khawaarij and Political Activists around the corners of globe actually saw something in the da'wah of the likes of Safar al-Hawali, Salman al-Awdah and Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, that which they could identify with. This was hardly surprising because the spring and fountain of them all were the books of Sayyid Qutb. Subsequently, the bridge and gap between the outright pure Khawaarij and those who had begun to propound the doctrines, after having been poisoned by some of its figureheads, was narrowed down.

## **How To Belittle The Affair Of The Innovators**

The task of Salman al-Awdah was a bit more difficult in the sense that he knew that no Salafi would entertain the notion of abandoning the likes of Ibn Katheer and at-Tabaree and to embrace az-Zilaal of Sayyid Qutb. To this end, he and others innovated the bid'ah of al-Muwaazanah (mentioning the good points when criticising someone) in order to bring the Qutubi Heresy one step closer to the Salafis and so that the books of Sayyid Qutb would be more easily swallowed by them. By claiming that only mentioning the negative points of individuals when criticising them was tantamount to dhulm (oppression) – al-Awdah, justified benefiting from the “positive” elements of a deviated individual or one who had many mistakes or aspects of innovation. Al-Awdah portrayed Qutb as an Imaam of Guidance (and he explicitly states this till today). Thereby, Qutb's books were spread amongst the youth and his doctrine was introduced to their mental faculties. In a

---

<sup>6</sup> He stated, “**Truly this group is as they have been described: They are Khawarij with regards to the du'at (preachers); Murji'a with regards to the rulers; Rafida with regards to the jamaa'at (Islamic groups); and Qadariya with regards to the Jews, Christians, and infidels**” in his well-known email propagated in early 2000.

similar manner, the works, writings and sayings of many of the other Innovators were given a new lease of life – such as the likes of al-Qaradawi.

### **Bolshevite Rehearsals**

As for Bolshevite Rehearsals, then the movement of Salman al-Awdah – which is typical of all activist movements, one that merely brings the youth together into one great big lump so that the leader and chief can direct them in whatever way he wills, like a herd of sheep – were gearing themselves up for the kinds of activities that had led to calamities and bloodshed in Syria and Egypt, repression and tribulations for the civilians and innocent, the spoiling of relations between the authorities and the people and further tension and suspicions on both sides, such that the security and safety that was already present would be dwindled. This was well-known about Salman and his methodology which was criticised by Imaam al-Albaani and labelled as “Ikhwaani”<sup>7</sup>. In fact, the affair reached such a level that the Communists were praised by al-Awdah and taken to be a model to be followed (in their revolutionary activities)!!

And this was the da'wah given by Salman al-Awdah to the Algerians when he advised them, **“Indeed, I believe that the time for making complaints has ended – or it has almost ended. I mean that the role played by the liberal men and women should not end at merely raising complaints to specific individuals, that “so and so happened” and “so and so happened”.**” (Cassette: “Humoom Multazimah” no. 106). So when it is the case that verbal complaints achieving nothing, what then remains but the use of the hand and force?!

And the one who took Dhul-Khuwaisarah Tamimi as his guide and model also said, “Why do many people imagine that self-sacrifice, and being persistent, patient and forbearing is a quality unique only to the heretical societies and is the way of the astray (nations) only, and

---

<sup>7</sup> The study of other movements and revolutionary figureheads is an integral part of the Qutubi da'wah and manhaj. For this reason you will find their works and their cassettes talking especially about those current (or past) affairs which will help them to mobilise their followers into actualising their goals. Hence, the detailed analysis of Afghanistan, or the Gulf War or Algeria **and the drawing of parallels from all of that for Saudi Arabia**.

To strengthen the above, compare it with one of the statements occurring in the cassette of Salman al-Awdah in this regard, “Min Hunaa ... Wa Hunaak”. A person in the gathering says to Salman al-Awdah, “I hope that you are not deceived by these bands (of individuals) regardless of their abundance, and regardless of how many phone calls they make and how their communications are spread. **And in Hasan al-Banna and Abbaasi Madani we have the best and closest example (to be followed).** O Shaikh, before you make any moves or remain still that you must confirm to us that you will make all of that in a solid and united front, and know that all of us are behind you (in all that you do). **And how many times does fear overtake me when I imagine the destiny of this revivalist awakening (sahwah), in that its various stages have not been defined and calculated. However, we require steadiness but we must be resolute in that which we intend to do.**”

Listen also to the praiser of Salman al-Awdah who uttered the following lines of poetry in front of Salmaan, just before he gave the lecture “Haqeeqat ut-Tatarruf”: **“Indeed, we are your men O Salmaan, so direct us. However you wish, for you are the example to be followed. Certainly, we are your men regardless of what the envious say. Indeed, we are your men, even if they revile and rebuke”.**

that the Jews, Christians and Communists and others are sacrificed... **and all the people saw how the defenseless Communists used to stand in front of the tanks after the revolution, with their bare chests... and many people think that the people of “Laa ilaaha ilallaaha” are not able to defend their religion and that they are not able to show patience over it. Why do we have an evil opinion of the people of Laa ilaaha illallaaha, to this level?! Why are we belittling the affair of all these Muslim masses in Algeria and other than Algeria..**” (Cassette: Kalimatu Haqqin Fee Mas’alat il-Jazaa’iriyah). And al-Awdah was merely calling for the supporting and encouragement of the Algerian revolution, which is in fact led by the Qutubiyah and neo-Kharijites, the Revolutionary Takfiris, for whom he had become an Imaam. Shaikh al-Albaani criticised both al-Awdah and al-Hawali in this regard for supporting and encouraging the Algerian Revolution, as occurs on cassette.

### **In The Land Of The Takfiris, The Best Aggrandiser Gains Imaamship**

Stated the Ibn Ma’een of the Era, Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee, when asked about the saying that Salman al-Awdah is the “Imaam of Qutubiyah”, “I personally do not say this, however he is not far from it. Do you not see how all of the Takfeeris and Khawaarij in all of the various parts of the world, without exception, consider him to be their Imaam? And opposite to this, they attack the Mashaayikh such as Ibn Baaz, al-Albaani and Ibn Uthaimen? By Allaah, my daughter, this country would not even have known Sayyid Qutb and his innovations, and nor would the youth have had any knowledge of him and become attached to him and start to show love for Ahl ul-Bid’ah had it not been for the writings of Shaikh Salmaan may Allaah guide him, and his making Sayyid an Imaam. Shaikh Salmaan hears and sees, just like you do from those Takfeeris, outside of this country, and he knows that they consider him to be an Imaam, so why does he and Shaikh Safar, why do they not publicly announce in every single place that they are free of them (the Takfeeris) and from their ideas in their own books, cassettes, magazines and newspapers and on the Internet? So that our youth and our sons and our lands can be freed from their tribulation? We are still waiting from these two Shaikhs to recant from their previous errors, for which we have not heard any recantation. And we also await for them to free themselves from Ahl ul-Bid’ah, those who in every place, especially the Takfeeris...” (3<sup>rd</sup> July 2000, phone conversation with a Sister from the Emirates).

### **Enter The Trojan Horse of Ahl ul-Bid’ah, Al-Muwaazanah**

So the *bid’ah* of al-Muwaazanah was entered into the religion, and then again, our Ulamaa stood to refute this wicked bid’ah, foremost amongst them Imaam al-Albaani<sup>8</sup>, and then

---

<sup>8</sup> **THE BID’AH OF AL-MUWAAZANAH**

And there occurs in “Al-Ajwibah al-Albaaniyyah ‘alaa As’ilah Abil-Hasan ad-Daa’iyah” in the “Silsilah al-Hudaa wan-Noor” Series (Cassette No. 850), the following discussion:

**Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Misri:** “The truth is our Shaikh that our brothers or those youth have brought many (issues) together and amongst them is their saying, “That it is necessary for anyone who wishes to speak about an Innovator, whose innovation and war against the Sunnah has become apparent, or about one who is not like that but who has erred in issues connected to the manhaj of Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa’ah – that no one should speak in these matters except when one also mentions all of his good points.” And this is what they

others from his brethren, such as the Ibn Ma'een of the Era and Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen<sup>9</sup>. And this too became a noose around the neck of every "revolutionary takfeeri" and those poisoned by them.

### **The Unfortunate Doctor And His Mansoori Kharijite Thesis**

Safar al-Hawali, under the direction of Mohammad Qutb, then authored the book "Dhaahirat ul-Irjaa" which was the intellectual tool and "thrust" used push the ideology of Sayyid Qutb further into the ranks of the Salafis making the Qutubite agenda closer to realisation. This book was described by Imaam al-Albaani as **"the extremity in evil"** and he also picked out over 80 errors in the book. Takfir was also made by sins in the book and this is partly why Imaam al-Albaani called this new cult who had hijacked Salafiyyah as **"The Khawaarij of the Era"** because they **"opposed many of the issues of the methodology of the Salaf"**. This, naturally, was a death blow to neo-Qutubite Apologeticism and its Think-Tank and it but increased them in their madness and schism and their state of oblivious, yet perfidious denial. In the aforementioned book, the

---

call this principle, "al-Muwaazanah" (counterbalancing) between the good and bad points. Many books and small works (have now) been written in this regard by those who hold onto this viewpoint, that it is necessary to adopt the methodology of the earlier people in criticising and that it is necessary to mention both the good and the bad points. So is this principle to be taken absolutely, or are their circumstances in which this principle does not apply? We desire a detailed explanation from you regarding this matter, may Allaah bless you."

**Imaam al-Albani:** "The detailed (explanation) is: And every good lies in following (ittibaa') the Salaf. So did the Salaf used to do this?"

**Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Misri:** "May Allaah protect you, our Shaikh. They use as evidence certain (textual) statements such as the statements of our Scholars concerning the Shi'ah for example, that "So and so is reliable and trustworthy (thiqah) in hadeeth, but a vile Raafidi". They use statements like this as evidence. And then they desire to build the complete principle (i.e. that alluded to earlier) upon them, without at the same time looking at the thousands of statements in which there only occurs, "Liar", "Abandoned", "Vile".

**Imaam al-Albani:** **"This is the way of the Innovators.** When a scholar of hadeeth speaks about a righteous man who is a scholar and a jurist, saying about him, "He is poor in his memory", does he also say, "He is a Muslim, and he is righteous and he is a jurist, and he is one who ought to be referred to in matters of deriving evidences for the Sharee'ah rulings (from the texts)." Allaah is Great! The truth is that the aforementioned principle is very important [but] it comprises a number of very important subsidiary matters (finer details) relevant to our times.

From where [did they derive this] that when the circumstance arises for explaining the mistakes of a Muslim, whether he is a caller [daai'yah] or not, that it is necessary for a lecture in which his good deeds - from their beginning to their end are mentioned? Allaahu- Akbar!! A strange thing!! By Allaah! A strange thing!"

<sup>9</sup> Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen was asked, "And he (Adnaan Ar'oor) says: "It is from justice (adl) and equity (insaaf) when giving advice (about innovations) and warning from innovations that we mention their (the perpetrators') good aspects alongside their bad aspects."

The Shaikh replied, in anger for the sake of the truth, **"I say to you, No! ... No! ... No! ... This is an error. Listen to me O man (Yaa Rajul)! Listen O man, when refuting it is not good that I mention the good points of the person. If I mention his good points while I am refuting him, this weakens my refutation of him."** (Cassette: As'ilat Irlandiyah).

unfortunate doctor who neither knew the reality of Irjaa' and nor the reality of Imaam al-Albaani<sup>10</sup>, whom he had accused with Irjaa', had propounded the theory of the Mansoori Kharijites – those who claimed that not performing takfir of the one who abandons the prayer out of laziness and neglect is Irjaa' because it entails actions are not from Imaan<sup>11</sup>. He also propounded the theory of the Kharijites of takfir by commission of major sins, or by persistence upon major sins and he was partnered in that by the likes of Salman al-Awdah.

### **Add The Jins ul-'Amal Theorem To That**

Further, he also propounded the doctrine of the Khawaarij by claiming that one who dies while having the basis of Imaan upon his heart and tongue, but not having done any good deeds, dies as an apostate. He opposed the understanding of the Salaf that Imaan has an asl (foundation) and furoo' (branches), and subsequently performed takfir on account of abandonment of the furoo'<sup>12</sup>. The well-known difference on the issue of the performance

---

<sup>10</sup> Stated the propounder of the Mansoori Kharijite Theorem, **"Rather, one who fights against partisanship for madhhabs has himself fallen into it (Irrjaa'), such as Shaikh al-Albaani"** (Dhaahirat ul-Irrjaa' p.658). And also, **"And the Shaikh – may Allaah preserve him – is amongst the most severe of people in fleeing and making others flee from the blind-following of the Hanafees in the subsidiary issues (furoo', i.e. fiqh). So how can that be when this (i.e. Irrjaa') is from the major matters (usool, i.e. aqidah)"** (Dhaahirat ul-Irrjaa' p.726). He means here, how can the Shaikh forbid blind-following in matters of fiqh, and then fall into what the Hanafees fell into of matters of aqidah (i.r. Irrjaa').

Stated Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen (hafidhahullaah): **"Whoever accused Shaikh al-Albaanee of Irrjaa' has erred. Either he is one who does not know al-Albaanee or he is one who does not know Irrjaa'.**

Al-Albaanee is a man from Ahl us-Sunnah – may Allaah have mercy upon him –, a defender of it, an Imaam in Hadeeth. We do not know of anyone who has surpassed him in our time. However, some people – and we ask Allaah's pardon – **have jealousy in their hearts**. For when [one of them] sees that a person has been met with acceptance [by the people], he begins to find fault with him on account of something, just like the hypocrites, those who used to defame those believers who would give freely in charity – and those [i.e. hypocrites] who would find nothing but the striving of [the believers]. So they would defame the one who would give charity in abundance, and also the poor person who would give charity!

We know the man from his books – may Allaah have mercy upon him – and I know him from sitting with him on occasions. He is Salafi in aqeedah, of sound manhaj. **However some people desire to perform takfeer of the servants of Allaah on account of something that Allaah did not perform takfeer of them. Then they claim that whoever opposes them in this takfeer is a Murji' – a lie, slander, and mighty fabrication. Therefore, do not listen to this saying regardless of whomever it comes from!"** Cassette: Makaanamaat Ma'a Mashaayikh ad-Da'wah as-Salafiyyah (Part 4) Dated 12<sup>th</sup> July 2000 CE

<sup>11</sup> Stated Safar al-Hawali, **"And no one says that the one who abandons it (the prayer) is not a kaafir except one who has been affected by the (thought of) al-Irrjaa', whether he realises it or not."**!! (Dhaahirat ul-Irrjaa' pp.650-651). And also, **"...without their knowing that the source of this doubt (of the absence of takfir of the one who abandons prayer) and its foundation is actually from Irrjaa'!!"** (p.419).

<sup>12</sup> **BENEFIT: IMAAN HAS A FOUNDATION (ASL) AND BRANCHES (FUROO')**

Stated Muhammad bin Nasr al-Marwazi, in his refutation of the Murji'ah (Ta'dheem Qadr is-Salaat 2/703), **"And we say: That Imaan has an asl, foundation. If even an atom's weight is removed from it, the appellation of Imaan will be removed altogether (i.e. the whole of Imaan will be gone). And from whomever this is not removed, the appellation of Imaan will remain with him. However, after this it increases, adding Imaan on**

top of his Imaan. Then if there is any decrease in what is additional to this foundation (asl), the actual foundation does not decrease, that which is affirmation (iqraar) that Allaah is the truth and what He says is the truth. This is because any deficiency with respect to this is actually doubt (shakk) about Allaah, [as to whether ] He is true or not? And this is like the example of a date-palm tree that has branches and leaves. Every time a branch falls from it, the appellation of "tree" remains for it, however after this decrease it is in a state other than what it was before of perfection, but without its naming changing. It is tree that is deficient in its branches, and other trees are more perfect than it since they are complete. And Allaah the Mighty and Majestic said, "The example of a good word is like a good tree whose foundation (asl) is firmly established and whose branches reach up to the heaven..." to the end of the verse. So He made the example of this tree an example for the word "Imaan", and He made it have a foundation (asl) and a branch (far')..."

And after mentioning many of the groups of the Murji'ah, Ibn Mandah said, "And Ahl ul-Jamaa'ah said: Imaan is all of the acts of obedience, those of the heart, tongue and all of the limbs, and it has a foundation (asl) and a branch (far'). Its foundation is knowledge of Allaah (ma'rifah) and attestation (tasdeeq) of Him and of what ever came from Him (of revelation) by the heart and the tongue, along with submission (khudoo'), love of Him, fear of Him, reverence of Him and abandoning pride, arrogance and resistance. So if a person brings this foundation, then he has entered into Imaan and the name of Imaan is applied to him and the rulings pertaining to it come into effect concerning him. And then such a person cannot have perfected (mustakmilan) his Imaan until he acts upon the branches. And the branches are what are made obligatory upon him, or the avoidance of forbidden matters." (al-Imaan 1/331).

Ibn Hazm had errors in the issue of Sifaat yet was praised by the likes of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah in the issues of Imaan and for refuting the Murji'ah comprehensively. He said, "**And he (alaihissalaam) explained that whoever has a seed's weight of goodness will be removed from the Hellfire, then one who has an atoms weight of goodness, and then what is less than that and so on. Until one who had never performed any good at all, except having the testimony of faith for Islaam will be removed from it. Hence, it is obligatory to halt at the texts, since all of them explain each other.**" (al-Fisal 4/90).

Ibn Hazm also said, "He did not declare a disbeliever one who abandoned action, but he declared a disbeliever the one who abandoned the saying (i.e. the testimony of faith). This is because the Messenger of Allaah (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) made the judgement of kufr upon the one who refused to make the saying (the testimony), even if he knew of its correctness in his heart. And he also judged that the one who knew with his heart and pronounced with the tongue to be removed from the Fire, even if he did not do a single deed of goodness." (Ad-Durrah Feema Yajib I'tiqaduhu p.337)

Ibn Rajab al-Hanbali said in explanation of the saying of Allaah's Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) "And then a group of people will be taken out from the Fire who had not done any good whatsoever", he said, "...And what is meant by his saying, 'who had not done any good whatsoever' is the actions of the limbs, even though they have the foundation (asl) of Tawheed with them..." (at-Takhweef Min an-Naar p.255). And he also said (p.256), "This proves that those whom Allah will remove through His Mercy, without any intercession (shafaa'ah) from anybody else from the creation, are the people of Tawheed who had not done a single deed of goodness with their limbs."

Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said, "It (Imaan, faith) is made up of

- A **basis (asl)** without which it cannot be complete
- **Obligatory [duties] (wajib)**, whose neglect cause Imaan to be deficient and render the one guilty of this punishable
- **Recommended [duties] (mustahabb)** whose absence cause the greatness of rank to be lost.

And amongst the people are those who wrong their own souls, those who are just in between (following a middle course), and those who are foremost (in goodness) [with respect to their relation to entities and acts such as] hajj, the physical body, the mosque and other such entities, actions and characteristics. And from its various elements [i.e. those that constitute Imaan] are those which if they are not present will reduce it [from

of takfir on account of the abandonment of prayer out of laziness and neglect was a barrier to Safar al-Hawali's thesis, and thus he attempted to portray anyone who refrained from takfir as being upon the thought of al-Irjaa'. Once the issue of prayer was out of the way and in the bag, takfir on account of the abandonment of the rest of the actions was appropriately justified.<sup>13</sup>

### **The Intellectual Perspective And Objective**

All of this intellectual garb was actually leading to the justification of the saying of absolute and unrestricted takfir of the rulers who do not rule by what Allaah has revealed, without adherence to the well-known tafseel of the Salaf. Anyone who subsequently did not agree to this view could be rendered a Murji', and in this manner, the thought and ideology of Sayyid Qutb could be disguised as pure Salafi doctrine.

---

being] most perfect, and those which will cause it to fall short of perfection – and this is abandoning the obligatory duties and falling into the forbidden matters.

And from it [i.e. the various elements of Imaan] is that which will cause its **basis (rukn)** to be impaired, and that is the abandoning of **belief (i'tiqad)** and **speech (qawl)** – and which the Murji'ah and Jahmiyyah claim to be [what justifies] the appellation [of Imaan]. **And by this [classification] will the doubts of all the sects be put to an end. The foundation (asl) [of Imaan] is in the heart and its perfection lies in the outward actions**, in opposition to Islam since its basis is what is external and its perfection lies in the heart..." Majmoo Fataawaa (7/637).

Muhammad Ibn Jareer at-Tabaree said, in his quotation of the madhhab of Ahl us-Sunnah on Imaan, "So some of them said, "Imaan is the knowledge (ma'rifah) of the heart, affirmation (iqraar) with the tongue, and the actions of the limbs. Whoever brought two of these but did not bring a third one, then it is not permissible for it to be said about him that he is a "Believer (Mu'min)". However it is said to him, "If the two matters that he brought are the knowledge of the heart and the affirmation of the tongue, and yet he was neglectful in his actions, then he is a Muslim". And some others who hold onto this saying have said: "If this is the case then we say that he is a Believer (Mu'min) in Allaah and his Messenger, but we do not call him a Believer in the absolute sense." And some others who are also upon the same view said, "If this is the case then it is said to him "Muslim" and it is not said "Believer (Mu'min)", unless the exception (istithnaa) is made such that it is said, 'He is a Believer (Mu'min) if Allaah wills'." (at-Tabseer Fee Ma'aalim ud-Deen pp.188-189).

<sup>13</sup> For a more in-depth discussion of this issue refer to the section "Are Actions a Condition for the Validity of Imaan or its Perfection?" in "Minhaaj us-Sunnah" Issue 1 (pp. 23-39) and "Tabyeen Kadhīb al-Muftaree" (a refutation of one of young pretenders in the UK by the name of Abu Zubair) in the section dealing with the recent verdicts of the Permanent Committee on Irjaa' and also refer to the cassettes "al-Furqaan Fee Masaa'il il-Imaan" of Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Misri al-Ma'rabi, who has explained this matter well.

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** The confusion in this issue arises due to not making a clear distinction between whether one is attempting to illustrate the reality of Imaan or whether one is attempting to illustrate when can a Muslim be judged an apostate, that is making the ruling of takfir upon him. Speaking about the one who has the basis of Imaan in his heart, suspecting him of not having done a single good deed of goodness, while he commits sins (beraing in mind the difference of opinion concerning the issue of prayer) is at best a theoretical issue which cannot be verified in real life. For this reason, those who withhold from takfir and say such a one is not a kaafir, do so from the point of view of the principles of takfir, since the basic principle is that Islaam is affirmed for a person and mere doubt and suspicion is not sufficient to remove it.



Shaikh Abdul-Malik ar-Ramadaanee – who had advised the likes of Safar and Salmaan extensively and tirelessly, stated, “The delegate of Alee bin Haaj in The Algerian Front (FIS), called al-Hashimi Sahnouni used to label everyone who did not perform takfir of the rulers with this name, “Murji”. So when I asked him, what was his reference point for this, he said, ‘Mohammad Qutb and ‘Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaliq’.” (Madarik un-Nadhar).

From here anyone who did not agree to this Kharijite doctrine and to this bloodthirsty Takfir was rendered a Murji’ and it became the hallmark of Satan upon the tongues of his brethren amongst mankind<sup>14</sup>. And hence the “revolutionary takfeeris”, the “Jihaadees” and those with their affectations began to resound with this in the various parts of Allaah’s spacious Earth.

### **The Practical Perspective**

In addition to all of what has preceded the Qutubite theoreticians also preached the doctrine of “Democratic Kharijism” using the incident of Dhul-Khuwaisarah at-Tamimi as an argument to justify the open rejection of those in authority upon the pulpits and in the sermons. Add to this, their ascription of kufr to the society around them, their making takfir of the sinners, and their mobilising of the youth for their activism and demands for the “Social Justice” of Ibn Qutb. For the finer details of this scandal refer to “Intermediate Qutubism” (GRV070004).

### **The Severest Fitnah**

As for the fitnah of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, then **“...perhaps amongst the severest of tribulations that Allaah’s Messenger warned us against is the fitnah of ‘Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, in this time, who has made his fitnah revolve around the Salafi Da’wah and its students...”** (Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee in An-Nasr ul-Azeez, p.52).

### **“Khawaarij” With The Scholars??**

Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq was known for his vehement attacks against the Mashaayikh of Ahl us-Sunnah and those of Saudi Arabia in particular such as the Permanent Committee and also the Body of Senior Scholars. They became “a battalion of mummified bodies”, “scholars of women’s menses and impurities”, “present in body,

---

<sup>14</sup> Shaikh Sa'd al-Hussain stated, “As for these brothers (the Jordanian Mashaayikh), I have known them for around fifteen years... and they by Allaah, are the best of those I know - I do not say in Jordan alone - but in the whole of Shaam, in terms of knowledge, manhaj (methodology) and da’wah (calling to Allaah)... **As for this doubt of Irjaa’ which Shaytaan has placed upon the tongues of their opponents**, then they (the opponents) have only made this accusation against them because they are calling to the Manhaj of Nubuwwah (Prophetic Methodology), the manhaj that opposes the ways and methods of the Takfeeris (takfeeriyoon) such as the likes of Sayyid Qutb, Hasan at-Turaabi and others amongst the biased partisans and political activists...” (Refer to the Cassette, “Rihlati Ilaa Bilaad ul-Haramayn” of Shaikh Ali Hasan) .

Imaam Ibn Baaz was asked, “Concerning Jamaa’atul-Jihaad and co-operation with them?” He replied, “They are not to be co-operated with, nor are they to be given salaams to. Rather, they are to be cut off from, and the people are to be warned against their evil. Since they are a fitnah and are harmful to the Muslims, and they are the brothers of the Devil (Shaytaan)!” (From the taped cassette (no.11), recorded in the month of Dhul-Hijjah 1408H (1987CE) at ‘at-Tawiiyyatul-Islaamiyyah.)

absent in mind”, “perfect and complete ignorance” and much more – all but repugnant lies and wicked slanders. And this is what the Kuwaiti youth learnt from Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, as a result of which the Senior Mashaayikh and Imaams became unworthy of being followed in the affairs of “fiqh ul-waaqi”. Ihyaa at-Turaath was Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq’s organisation, which pushed and continues to push his thought and continues to harbour the Hizbiyyah that was created by Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq.

### Enter Shurocracy

This Innovator – as he was declared by Shaikh Muqbil bin Haadee – innovated the democracy of the Infidels into the religion of our Lord. And so he allowed entry into democratic elections and parliamentary activity. He claimed that this is the way forward. Unfortunately, ash-Shayjee, the Arch-Liar and Delusionist, had gathered numerous restricted and conditioned fataawaa of the Ulamaa in which they had allowed partaking in voting **upon the principle of avoiding the greater of two evils** – and he then built upon this the necessity of working in parliaments and democratic elections, and using the democratic apparatus and turned it into **an actual methodology to be followed**. And this was other than what our Imaams were upon.<sup>15</sup>

So this was one of the many iniquities in the Turaathi Saga.

---

<sup>15</sup> And the activists were declared liars by an explanation of Shaikh al-Albaanee as occurs in the cassette “Silsilah al-Hudaa wan-Noor” (1/352) when asked about this allowance of entry into elections (which was actually only a restricted and one-off allowance for the Algerians, due to what they portrayed to him). He was asked, “We have heard that you said – O Shaikh – that it is permissible to enter into parliamentary elections, but with conditions?!”

Shaikh al-Albaani replied, “**No it is not permissible**. These conditions – when they are any – are purely theoretical and speculative, and not knowledge-based. So do you remember my conditions that I stated?”

The questioner said, “The first is that a person should protect his own self (i.e. protect his religion)”. The Shaikh asked, “And is this possible?” The questioner replied, “I have never exercised this (so I do not know)”. The Shaikh said, “And if Allaah wills you will not exercise this! It is not possible to meet these conditions. And we observe many of the people who at the beginning of their lives – we could see from their appearance, from their clothes, from their beards – and then when they entered the Parliament, then their appearance changed! And following that they began to justify it... And likewise we would see people entering the Parliament with Islamic Arabic clothing and then after a few days they changed their clothing!! So is this an evidence of corruption or of rectification?!”

The questioner said, “Shaikh, I mean the brothers in Algeria, and their work there and their entry into the Political arena?” The Shaikh replied, “**We do not advise this! We do not advise political work these days in any of the Islamic countries...**”

The Activist Thinkers distorted a lot of the verdicts of the Ulamaa, just like they did with the verdict of Shaikh al-Albaanee which was unique to the Algerians, such as that of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen – and then from all of them, built a methodology that requires, by obligation, every Muslim to be engaged in political activity!! Whereas in truth all of those verdicts were made for unique and specific circumstances.

## **Splitting And Differing Is Absolute Goodness, Unity Upon Sunnah And Salafiyyah Is Destruction(!)**

Then in addition to that Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq also innovated Hizbiyyah into the religion of our Lord, and he claimed that the existence of sects, groups and parties – all of whom were in opposition to the creed and methodology of the Salaf was “goodness”, and that anything other than this is “destruction”. This is how Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq describes the sayings of our Lord with respect to splitting and differing. This is how he describes the warnings of our Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) against the sects and splitting and differing and so on. This is how Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq aggrandises and praises Tabligh, Ikhwaan and Hizb ut-Tahrir and other than them from the wandering strayers – who have but defaced the aqidah, adulterated the manhaj and led many from mankind from the light of Tawheed to the mires of Shirk and Innovation – and refuge is from Allaah. This is why his fitnah was “...**the severest of tribulations that Allaah’s Messenger warned us against...**”<sup>16</sup>

---

### **<sup>16</sup> THE SICK CONDITION OF ABDUR-RAHMAAN ABDUL-KHAALIQ**

Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, when Bannaawism began to slowly take over his person, spoke with the multiplicity of groups and parties, i.e. justified the existence of all the various Islamic groups present today, despite their differences in aqidah and manhaj and their falling into the acts of kufr and shirk (in the case of some). This being in direct conflict with the Book and the Sunnah, the Ulamaa began to refute him and advise him. And this continued for a number of years. When Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq did not listen, one of the students of knowledge from Kuwait took some of the errors of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq to Imaam Ibn Baaz (amongst them, his saying about the multiplicity of groups). Imaam Ibn Baaz refuted these claims and advised the latter to correct himself.

Following this, Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq made an open display of his supposed repentance and that he had taken it all back. His open supposed repentance took place on 20<sup>th</sup> September 1994, in an article called “Tanbeehaat wa Ta’aqqubaat” in which he glorified the Permanent Committee and called them “my fathers” and so and he also made many lies against the Salafi Mashayikh such as Shaikh Rabee’ (refer to Jamaa’ah Waahidah of Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee) . His repentance was somewhat exaggerated, and while previously he had called our Ulamaa, “mummified, absent in mind and present in body”, “perfect and complete ignorance”, “their da’wah does not mean anything” and other such great calamities (which we have documented elsewhere, GRV070004), he then showed the outward love and respect.

Then in a cassette, which is at least 15 months after his open repentance, there occur a number of questions and answers, in which the great deceit of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq is uncovered and his persistence in innovation and heresy laid bare. Stated Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee:

“The questioner asks him (Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq) about the verdict of Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Bin Baaz which was in al-Muslimoon magazine (23<sup>rd</sup> December 1995) and which also contained the refutations of al-Qaradaawi, the Straying Innovator, against it. He answered the question by giving a diplomatic answer which indicated that he was not actually pleased with this fatwaa (i.e. of Ibn Baaz) and this was after his recantation by a long time since his recantation took place on 14<sup>th</sup> Rabee’ ul-Awwal 1415H, corresponding to 20<sup>th</sup> September 1994. Then the questioner said to him, “O Shaikh, in relation to the multiplicity of Islamic groups in the Islamic world and their abundance, such as al-Ikhwaan ul-Muslimoon, Jamaa’at ut-Tabligh, Hizb ut-Tahreer and others, we hear two views. One saying this is a good thing because the good points (of this multiplicity) outweigh the bad points. Another orientation which says that this is differing and splitting and this is not allowed because its bad points are greater than its good points?” To which Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq replied, **“Indeed this is a good thing absolutely and there are no negative points in this at all, in splitting and differing. This is not correct...”** The questioner said after, “There is an orientation which states that evil of the multiplicity of groups in the Islamic world outweighs the good, what is your view on this?”. To

And this was also another of the greatest of iniquities in the Turaathi Scandal of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq.

In addition to all that Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq also raised high the banner of the innovated Tawhid al-Haakimiyyah and fell into the takfir of Muslim societies, let alone enticing many of the sons of Ahl us-Sunnah with his Deenar and Dirham and causing them to split and fall into dissension, as was witnessed in Sudan, Jeddah, Kuwait, Indonesia, Yemen and elsewhere.

### **Haakimiyyah Is The Merchandise Of True Salafiyyah**

As for al-Haakimiyyah, then Imaam al-Albaani was the first to revive it in the last century when he vehemently opposed the fanaticism and blind-following in the madhhabs, and when he made his objective to establish an Islamic life based upon the Divine revelation as is well known in his da'wah objectives – which he started putting in his books over 50 years ago.

Imaam al-Albani stated, “‘Al-Haakimiyyah’ is a branch of the branches of Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah, **and those who focus their attention upon this newly invented saying in the present age use it as a weapon not to teach the Muslims the Tawheed that all of the Prophets and Messengers came with, but rather as a political weapon.** So if you wish I will establish for you what I have just said, even though this question has repeatedly been answered by me, many times - or if you wish we will continue upon our topic. I have said in similar circumstances, as support for what I have just said, that usage of the word ‘al-Haakimiyyah’ is part of the political da'wah that is particular to some of the parties present today ...**So if it were not for the fact that they use this saying as a tool for political propaganda of theirs, then we would say, ‘This is our merchandise that has been returned to us...’** (Al-Muslimoon no.639)

Ahl us-Sunnah have never rejected the Haakimiyyah of Allaah, rather they have rejected its use as a political tool, which is something that was initiated by Sayyid Qutb who claimed al-Haakimiyyah is most salient feature of Uloohiyyah and that it is the meaning embodied in the Kalimah, “Laa ilaaha ilallaaha”. Alongside this Sayyid Qutb made takfir of all Muslim societies and called for destructive Jihaads against the Muslims who do not live under total Sharee'ah rule. The dangerous effects of this doctrine was observed by the Ummah at large from the early 1960s onwards, and it was this very doctrine that was being

---

which he replied, **“This is destruction (hadm), destruction, destruction this is. This is an action of destruction”.**

This is how Abdur-Rahmaan acts, and does not care at all about his recantation in front of the esteemed Shaikh Ibn Baaz and nor in front of the others from the Ulamaa and understanding ones, those in front of whom he announced publicly, in front of them, his recantation... and Allaah knows best whether he considers the people and their Scholars to be “a battalion of mummified people”... So where is the respect of Abdur-Rahmaan for Ibn Baz and the Hai'ah Kibaar ul-Ulamaa, which he claims he does, when it is the case that he does not even give respect for other Scholars and other people...” (an-Nasr ul-Azeez, pp. 163-164)

revived by the likes of Safar al-Hawali, Salmaan al-Awdah and Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and others.

### **The Inevitable Split**

So it was all of this (and many, many other serious affairs that we have left out for the sake of conciseness) that Ahl us-Sunnah rejected and refuted and warned against. This was the starting point of the fitnah which rendered Ahl us-Sunnah into two groups: a) those who remained upon the Sunnah, upon Salafiyyah and adhered to the way of the Salaf and the clarifications of the Ulamaa on these issues of methodology and b) those who took to partisanship and defended the Activists and also defended their deviations and heresies, having been poisoned with their way of thinking.

The second group then began to parrot what was used by their mentors and leaders in order to ridicule and rebuke Ahl us-Sunnah, namely, that they were “spies”, “government agents”, “Murji’ah, Khawaarij, Raafidah, Qadariyyah”, “ignorant of fiqh ul-waaqi’”, “deniers of Jihaad”, “supporters of the New World Order”, “neo-Salafis” and other than that. And this became the religion that they followed until the present day. These were the terms and labels they used in order to attack the methodology of the Prophets, and its adherents from the Senior Imaams, Mashaayikh, Students of Knowledge, associates and followers.

And this is what gave us conviction that these newly-arisen, foolish-minded ones had a devised plot and an agenda. For had they merely called for ruling by the Sharee’ah and had they followed the correct methodology in advising the rulers, and bringing about reform - instead of aggrandising the Innovators, attacking the Imaams of Ahl us-Sunnah, performing takfir of Muslim societies, nation states and the sinners and opposing the manhaj of the Salaf in a whole variety of different issues - no rejection would have been shown against them – but when their calls for “rectification” and “social justice” and “haakimiyyah” were coupled with what we have already discussed in our discourse, the Salafi Mashaayikh **“doubted their intentions and realised that the position held by these activists was one not based upon the Shari’ah as such, but upon blind partisanship and political machination, and that this group had a methodology and an agenda”** as the author of “al-Qutubiyyah, Hiyal-Fitnah Fa’rifooahaa” aptly noted. And our Mashaayikh were indeed correct in all of that, walhamdulillaah, may Allaah reward them well, and cause them to remain a thorn in the throat of Qutubiyyah and its rowdy hooligans.

Perhaps this is sufficient as a background to the trials and tribulations that were brought into the ranks of Ahl us-Sunnah by the Ahl ul-Ahwaa, those who entered into its ranks, the books of bid’ah and zandaqah and who gave a new lease of life for the Ahl ul-Bid’ah and who in turn accused the Salafi Mashaayikh of causing the split and separation(!). For more details refer to “al-Qutubiyyah”, the book that the Qutubiyyah themselves tried to burn and destroy in Dhammaam, and also “Madaarik un-Nadhar fis-Siyaasah” which was praised by Imaam al-Albaani, Shaikh Abdul-Muhsin al-Abbaad and others and which is one large, hurtful, painful thorn in the throat of the biased partisans, walhamdulillaah.

## **In Summary**

In summary, the fitnah started when Salmaan al-Awdah entered the books of bid'ah and zandaqah to the youth of Ahl us-Sunnah and when he turned the Mocker of Moosaa (alaihis-salaam), the Reviler of Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu), the Mukaffir of Banu Umayyah and the reviver of just about every innovation in history into an "Imaam of Guidance". The fitnah started when Salman al-Awdah began to defend and aggrandize the Innovators and began to propound certain views which were in reality aimed at actualising the Qutubi Agenda, such as innovating the bid'ah of al-Muwaazanah, and giving erroneous verdicts such as allowing the saying "So and So Shaheed" without making the exception, distinguishing between al-Firqat un-Naajiyah and at-Taa'ifat ul-Mansoorah, and also his belittlement and mockery of the Ulamaa and so on. His connection with Muhammad Suroor was also clear and known for over a decade or so. His direction was clear.

Likewise when Safar al-Hawaali, unfortunately poisoned from the direction of Muhammad Qutb, when he too followed in the same direction – but on a more intellectual front – so he propounded upon certain theories that would justify accusing Ahl us-Sunnah and its Imaams and anyone who opposed them with being "Murji'ah". He reviled and mocked Imaam al-Albaani, put him in the same league as some of the contemporary Innovators, such as Muhammad Sa'eed Ramadaan al-Bootee. He also aggrandized and praised and raised the Innovators. He put Sayyid Qutb in the same league as the Shaikhs of Islaam, Ibn Taymiyyah and Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab. He made takfir of the sinners and also spoke with the apparent meaning of the verses related to rule and rulership, as well as propounding the theory of the takfir based upon the abandonment of the outward actions, in the name of "Jins ul-Amal".

The above two had clearly been poisoned and had begun to show their loyalty to the Innovators. It was only a short amount of time before the effects became clearly apparent. This was when the fitnah started and which split the ranks. They opposed many of the issues of methodology of the Salaf, and these issues became the source of confusion for many unsuspecting people.

Likewise, Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq was well-known for his scathing and wicked attacks upon our scholars and belittling them and mocking them. He justified the presence of all the astray groups and sects such as Tabligh, Ikhwaan and Hizb ut-Tahreer claiming that there is nothing but manifest goodness in all this splitting and differing. He innovated Hizbiyyah into the religion of our Lord and then persisted upon this Innovation. He also entered the democracy of the Infidels into the religion of our Lord and justified all of the above in the name of "collective work". He split the ranks of Ahl us-Sunnah with his deenaar and his dirham, and also taught the youth how to lie and become skilful at that as well, for he himself had no problems in even lying and exaggerating affairs to the Ulamaa. This has been noted about him from the likes of Shaikh Rabee' and Abdullaah as-Sabt and one can see examples of all of this in "an-Nasr ul-Azeez 'alaa ar-Radd al-Wajeez" of Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee.

So this was the beginnings of the fitnah when some from the newly-arisen ones began to make some of the affairs of Sunnah and Salafiyyah to be subject to ijtihaad and subject to acceptance or rejection. So they innovated, went astray and led others astray, winning the support of none but Ahl ul-Bid'ah in all of that, especially, the various groups of the neo-Khawaarij and the Revolutionary Takfiris.

Our Ulamaa merely stood to correct the newly-arisen ones, to advise them and direct them away from that which they had innovated and introduced, but they refused and showed but arrogance and persistence. So our Ulamaa began to warn from their danger because their affair had become sufficiently clear. Unfortunately, many from the sons of Ahl us-Sunnah were led to believe that all of these issues and differences were “issues of personal ijtihaad” and so the likes of these ones only created more confusion for everybody else, giving their own analysis of the state affairs, whereas they were in reality ignorant of what was actually going on.

The essence of the matter is that the likes of the Political Activists argued by way of al-Haakimiyyah and the plots and plans of the enemies and the humiliation of the Ummah – that politics is the way forward, and collective work is the way forward and parliaments are the way forward and activism is the way forward and open demonstrations and hostility is the way forward, while at the same time they waged a way against the ones who called to the Methodology of the Prophets and that of the Salaf. And our Ulamaa said “No”. It doesn't matter how good your intentions are and how dire the state of the Ummah is, you cannot depart from the Methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah. You cannot abandon the Sunnah, you cannot choose to leave the way of the Salaf. You are not allowed to innovate, make your own “personal ijtihaads” and choose your own ways, some of which you have innovated yourself and some of which you have merely taken from those before you (i.e. Qutb, Banna etc.). These were the true realities. This is where the split occurred. So there were two groups, those who remained upon the concepts of Sunnah and Salafiyyah, manifestly and clearly, and those who took to the concepts of Bid'ah, Qutubiyyah and Bannaawiyyah and around whom there were many confused ones, both beguiled and bewildered – wal-Iyaadhu billaah.

## **The Intended Meanings Behind The Sentence: Murji'ah with the Rulers, Khawaarij with the Du'aat, Raafidah with the Islamic Groups, Qadariyyah with the Infidels**

It is perhaps necessary that we discuss the various meanings that are intended by this slanderous phrase and by which the Methodology of the Prophets is attacked and replaced by the Methodology of the Khawaarij and Straying Heretics.

### **Murji'ah with the Rulers**

Because Ahl us-Sunnah do not rush to perform takfir of the rulers who judge by other than what Allaah has revealed, due to great tribulations that result from all of this, and because they take to conservatism in this regard, waiting for the Senior and Erudite Imaams to speak in these matters, heeding and paying regard to the statements of Shaikh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab and Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah – they are labelled as Murji'ah. Ahl us-Sunnah do not see any great benefit in this thought and ideology of takfir and spreading it amongst the youth, and in this regard they but follow the advice and admonition of the Mashaayikh.

Ibn al-Qayyim - may Allaah have mercy upon him - said: "This is a great topic, containing much benefit and due to ignorance of this topic a great mistake has fallen upon the Sharee'ah..." up until he said, after mentioning that the basis of the Sharee'ah is built upon the welfare and benefits of the servants: "...The Prophet (sallallaahu 'alaihi-wasallam) legislated for his ummah, the obligation of rejecting the evil so that by its rejection, the goodness that Allaah and His Messenger love is obtained. And when rejecting the evil leads to what is more evil and more hated by Allaah and His Messenger then it is not allowed to reject it - even if Allaah hates it and detests those who perform it (the evil). **And this is like rejection [inkaar] against the kings, and the ones in authority by coming out against them [with arms etc. to fight them] - for verily, that is the basis and foundation of every evil (sharr) and every tribulation (fitnah) till the end of time.**"<sup>17</sup>

Stated Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen, "These words are very good (i.e. Imaam al-Albaanee's). Meaning, that those people pass judgement against the Rulers of the Muslims, that they are disbelievers, what benefit do they achieve by judging them to be disbelievers? Are they able to put an end to them? They are not able. And when it is the case that the Jews have occupied Palestine for around 50 years, yet despite that the Islamic Ummah has not been able in its entirety – Arabs and Non-Arabs alike – to remove them from their place! How then, after this, can we go and strike those who rule over us with our tongues (i.e. make takfir of them) while we know that we are not capable of putting an end to them, and that blood will be shed, and the taking of wealth will become lawful, and even the honours of people. And then we will not even have achieved the desired result!! **Therefore, what is the benefit – such that if a person was to believe – in that which is between him and his**

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibn al-Qayyim in 'T'laam ul-Muwaqqi'een an Rabbil-Aalameen.'



**Lord – that amongst the rulers is one who is a disbeliever in truth, with the kufr that ejects from the religion - what then is the benefit in announcing this and spreading this, except the kindling of tribulation?!”** (Fitnah of Takfir, p.74)

However, all of this enrages the Qutubites – may Allaah destroy them and rid the earth of their tribulation – and but increased them in their disgust, hatred and intense dislike and their repugnant filthy partisanship – and so they claimed that our Ulamaa and the Salafis are “Murji’ah with the Rulers”(!!).

Yet Ahl us-Sunnah hold that the rulers are between the states of kufr, dhulm and fisq, in accordance with their beliefs and actions, and they adhere to the tafseel of the Salaf in this regard. They do not belittle this affair, and venerate the Sharee’ah of Allaah while at the same time being wary of the dangers of takfir and the resultant harm that can result – even where clear kufr is observed, as Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen has observed. Further, they adhere to the Methodology of the Prophets and understand the prevalent situation of the Ummah in light of the principles present in the Qur’aan. They treat the tyranny, oppression, lack of an Islamic authority and total Sharee’ah rule as mere symptoms of a more deeper and profound cause. They see that the actual cause and its treatment should be addressed and given priority, and not mere pre-occupation with the symptoms. Hence, the Methodology of the Prophets is their way, and this was the way that Ahl ul-Ahwaa, the Khawaarij of the Era, fought against, chief amongst them Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, Safar al-Hawali, Salman al-Awdah, ash-Shayijee and many others from amongst the Activists.

“The Khawaarij of the Era” saw this as defeatism and leniency (as had their chief, Sayyid Qutb before them) and a justification of the plots and plans of the Infidels in the Muslim lands, and mere submission to their ways. And this was one great and mighty lie, as is sufficiently clear to anyone of sound intellect and sanity of mind. And in the disaster in Algeria – which has seen the murder of 100,000 civilians since, there is the perfect illustration of the great wisdom in Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen’s words – and that is what we adopt as our beaten track – and this is but the beaten track of our Pious Forefathers – that of wisdom and intellect - and it is inshaa’allaah the very track with which we shall beat the Qutubite doctrine and cut it off in every generation, following in all of that, the trustworthy ones of every generation, may Allaah grant us His success in all of that, Ameen. Ameen. So the Qutubite accusation of Irjaa’ is very strongly tied to the issue of takfir of the rulers as the Salafi Mashaayikh have observed, **“And I know with full and perfect certainty, without a shred of doubt, that the issues in which discussions have increased these days - such as the promotion of the discussion of the issues of Imaan, Kufr, Irjaa, Action (‘amal), condition (shart) and validity (sihhah) - and in this particular manner - that all of this is directed towards and centered - with such persistence - upon a single issue and no other, and that is the issue of the takfir of the rulers.”** (Shaikh Ali Hasan al-Halaib in “Ajwibah al-Mutalaa’imah” p.42).

### **Khawaarij with the Du’aat**

And Ahl us-Sunnah, the Salafis, Atharis are accused of being “Khawaarij” with the Callers, because they do not believe that any individual after the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi

wasallam) is infallible, and because they hold that refuting Innovation and its people, and those who defend and promote the People of Innovation, is a must and necessity, and is something required by the Book and the Sunnah, by Ijmaa'. So when they stand to perform this obligation and speak about the Innovators or the People of Desires or those who promote and spread destructive doctrines within the Ummah, Qutubite theoreticians labelled them "Khawaarij".

They were also called "Khawaarij" because they were accused of making takfeer of the callers and not differentiating between "kufr" and a "kaafir" and "bid'ah" and "mubtadi'". And these were but fanciful hallucinations, caused and perpetuated by the hallucinogens inherent in the Qutubite doctrine, spread by Abdur-Razzaaq ash-Shaayijee, Arch-Liar and Delusionist and imbibed by the sons of Qutubism, newly arisen and foolish-minded. For Ahl us-Sunnah are the most weary of making takfir in falsehood and that is what they themselves have been cautioning the Qutubites for decades – nay cautioning the Qutubite Ancestry for 1400 years, every since Dhul-Khuwaisarah at-Tamimi - who was taken as a leader and guide by Salman al-Awdah in his justification for the open rejection of evil upon the pulpit<sup>18</sup> – raised high the slogan to be of all Revolutionary Takfeeris throughout the ages, "Social Justice (Adaalah)" and "Haakimiyyah".

When Shu'bah would seek nearness to Allaah by mentioning the negative aspects of Ashaabul-Hadeeth (that is the narrators), and invite his associates to spend an hour together for this, then what blame is upon Rabee' or Muqbil that they spend an hour recording a cassette on the Innovators and their works and their heretical writings, an exposing their affair? And what blame is there upon those who convey and transmit all of that, fulfilling the obligation that is upon them of not hiding the truth. Especially when the tribulation has reached all the various parts of the Earth, from the East to the West, due to the proliferation of those who carry these ideas, whether it be the Khawaarij of North Africa who emigrate to the UK, or the US or to Australia or Northern Europe or elsewhere – or those of Shaam or other than them from amongst those who have been poisoned from the direction of the two Qutbs, al-Banna and Suroor and their puppets?

And the emigrants (those who have fled from their own countries) bring these ideas into our communities, the while we attempt to preach Tawheed to the people, and so they come and preach Qutb and Mawdoodi's "al-Haakimiyyah" and "so and so leader is a Kaafir" and "this state is apostate" and "these scholars are government agents" and so on and so forth...and they wage a war against "the Methodology of the Prophets in Calling to Allaah, the Way of Intellect and Wisdom" and hate that this book should be taught to the people... and they promote and aggrandise the Partisans from amongst the Khawaarij...befooling and beguiling the people...

So this slander (of being Khawaarij for refuting the Innovators) is made so that the common-folk perceive Ahl us-Sunnah, the trustworthy ones in every generation, the

---

<sup>18</sup> Refer to the section "Democratic Kharijism" in "Readings in Intermediate Qutubism" (GRV070004), for an account of this very sad episode.

Muhadditheen, the Imaams of al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel to be the enemy in truth and so that Ahl ul-Bid'ah themselves become leaders and guides who can direct the Ummah.

Stated Shams ud-Deen as-Salafi al-Afghaani, "When the Imaams of the Sunan were severe and harsh against the People of Innovation and Tribulations, they were subdued and repressed. And when Ahl us-Sunnah became lax and frozen, soft, Ahl ul-Bid'ah raised their heads..." (al-Maatureediyah).

Abu Abdullaah Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Mufarraj said, "Abu Ja'far Ahmad bin Awn illaah (d. 378H) would show rejection against the People and Innovation and call them to account, showing extreme harshness against them, utterly humiliating them, always seek to pick out their faults, rushing to damage them, vehemently oppressive against them, chasing them away whenever he was able to, not allowing them to remain. And every one of them (Ahl ul-Bid'ah) used to be frightened of him, and would seek to hide and protect himself from him. He would never compromise with a single one of them, and nor would he allow any of them to remain safe. And if he came across evil and witnessed any deviation from the Sunnah, he would oppose it and would disgrace and humiliate (its perpetrator), and he would announce the affair of this person and declare his own disownment of him by mentioning the evil of such a one in the various public gatherings, and he would incite others against him such that he either destroyed him or caused him to abandon his evil and repugnant madhhab and his evil doctrine. And he would never cease to remain upon this habit, making Jihaad therein, seeking the Face of Allaah, up until he met Allaah." (Taareekh Dimashq 5/118). And he is the Muhaddith, Imaam, Ahmad bin Awn illaah bin Hudair Abu Ja'far al-Andalusee al-Qurtubee (d. 378H).

So we give glad tiding to Ahl ul-Ahwaa, Qutubites, Shurocrats, Hardened Bannaawites, their Loyalists, Affectionists, and Supporters, we give you glad tidings that we shall be "Khawaarij" with you, if that is what you call refutation of your deviations and heresies. We give you glad tidings that we shall enact the advice of Imaam Ibn Baaz to the Kuwaitis that they should **"enrage the People of Innovation and halt them at their limits..."**, the advice which perhaps terrified the weak-hearted amongst the sect of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, the sect that praised the various parties and groups and hated that their innovation and deviation should be refuted.

### **Raafidah with the Islamic Groups**

Because from that which Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah, the Salafis, the Atharis, worship their Lord is that splitting and differentiation and the emergence of parties and groups is blameworthy and to be rejected unconditionally, since that is the unchangeable dictate of the Book, the Sunnah and the Ijmaa' of the Salaf, then it enraged the Lords of Adulterated Principles and the Shurocratic Body Politic.

For the aim of Hassan al-Bannaa was to accommodate all the groups of bid'ah and dalaalah under one umbrella and then – either by way of democratic election or by way of rebellion to establish the "Imamah" (Islamic Leadership) and "Khilaafah" (Islamic Sharee'ah Rule and State). And the legacy of al-Bannaa, the first Mujaddid of Hizbiyyah in the last century,

was revived by the second Mujaddid of Hizbiyyah, the Shurocrat and Hardened Bannaawite, Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq.

So when the thorn in the throat of the Innovators, the Ibn Ma'een of the Era, Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee stood to raise high the slogan and motto of the Qur'aan and the Sunnah, "Jamaa'ah Waahidah, Laa Jamaa'at, Siraat Waahid, Laa Asharaat"<sup>19</sup>, the noose around the neck of Qutubite Apologeticism became tight and it caused a shortage of blood to the forelock, and this but led to a wild and wicked frenzy which but produced the likes of this accusation (that Ahl us-Sunnah are "Raafidah with the Jamaa'at) and other slanders.

So Qutubite theoreticians then opined that Ahl us-Sunnah reject all the goodness in the various groups and parties and that they make takfir of them and that all the Islamic parties and groups are **"off-shoots of the sects of the past that were outside of Islaam"** as textually stated by Abdur-Razzaaq ash-Shayjee al-Kadhdhaab in his scandalous writings.

And Ahl us-Sunnah indeed hold that the various groups and parties of today who have opposed the Salaf, in both aqidah, da'wah and manhaj are indeed amongst the generality of the seventy-two sects threatened with Hellfire, and that they are upon innovation and are led and founded by persons of innovation, and in this they are supported by the words and statements of the Senior Imaams, like Imaam al-Albaani, Imaam Ibn Baaz, the Mashaayikh, like Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen, Shaikh Muqbil, Shaikh Rabee' and others from the Ulamaa of Ahl us-Sunnah.

But this was a barrier to the Qutubite Agenda, and hence we saw the same tactic used in order to reject and revile the doctrine of the Book and the Sunnah and refuge is from Allaah. The sick condition of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq has already been noted and his promotion of that which Allaah and His Messenger forbade has already been noted. His saying that in splitting and difference there is **"manifest goodness"** and that claiming that splitting and differing brings about evil is **"destruction"**. The Book and the Sunnah calls to destruction in the sick mind of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, the man who is supposed to be the embodiment of the requirements of al-Haakimiyyah. This is his Haakimiyyah. This is his submission to the law of Allaah. Na'audhu Billaah.

### **Qadariyyah with the Jews, Christians and Infidels**

And when Ahl us-Sunnah adhered to the Methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah and threw to the wayside the Bolshevite Rehearsals and the Democracy of the Infidels disguised as "Shurocracy" that was being promoted by the likes of Salman al-Awdah, Safar al-Hawali, Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and those who took them as leaders and guides

---

<sup>19</sup> Imaam Ibn Baaz did not actually read this book but when some of the youth asked him about this book after the Partisans claimed he had spoken against it and refuted it – he called this a lie and also said he had not read yet read it (refer to MSC060011). And we also have on cassette the saying of Imaam Ibn Baaz, that "Jamaa'ah Waahidah, this is a very good title... this is correct" and words with that meaning, as occurs at the end of some of Aa'id ash-Shimree's lectures of refutation against the Surooriyyah.

from amongst the Revolutionary Takfiris and neo-Khaarijites, they (Ahl us-Sunnah) were labelled Qadariyyah.

What Qutubite Apologeticism intends by this accusation is that because Ahl us-Sunnah call to the methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah in correcting the people's beliefs and orientations from the impurities of innovation, fabricated ahaadeeth and so on, and then call them to be cultivated upon all of that, such that the true and successful and aided Jihaad will bear its fruits – inshaa'allaah – and such that Allaah will give establishment to the Muslims upon the earth, in accordance with His promise in Surah Noor (24:55) and because Ahl us-Sunnah do not indulge in their exaggerated brand of "Fiqh ul-Waaqi", or their adulterated Politics or Shurocracy or Bolshevite Rehearsals, or premature calls to (the overall, comprehensive) Jihaad – that they are therefore, submitting and compromising with the present day status-quo of the domination of the enemies and that they claim that it is the *qadr* of Allaah, hence we can do nothing to change it and therefore must accept it?!

And from what has preceded the futility of this lie and slander is clear to all those of sound intellect and sanity of mind. What they really intend to criticise is the actual methodology of the Prophets itself. This is what they consider "defeatism" and "leniency" and this is what they claim "supports the New World Order" as opined by that wicked, sinful, lying forelock, the Qutubist of the West. They claim that all of this is "a re-interpretation of the concepts of Sunnah and Salafiyyah in order to support the New World Order", and O Allaah bear witness against this wicked forgery and mighty lie.

Indeed the da'wah of Ahl us-Sunnah, which is based upon nothing but the methodology of the Prophets, will be aided by Allaah and Allaah will indeed perfect His light through it, even though the Hardened Bannaawites, Shurocrats and Qutubite Theoreticians may detest it and even though they may associate this Divine Methodology with the bid'ah of the Qadariyyah. And indeed, the Prophetic Seerah itself and the Seerah of the Salaf after them bears testimony to the truthfulness of this methodology, that it is divinely revealed and that it is the only way to success and victory, both in the life of this world and the hereafter. And for an illustration of that from the time of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah and the "Tartari" New World Order, refer to CAF020002.

As for the book that became a thorn in the throat of every Revolutionary Takfiri, "The Methodology of the Prophets in Calling to Allaah" by Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee, then it was praised by the Ulamaa of Ahl us-Sunnah and was indeed the pure doctrine of Ahl us-Sunnah. Consider well O Sunni, what Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen stated, in his praise and commendation of Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee, "Indeed we praise Allaah, Free is He from all imperfections, the Most High, that He makes it easy for our brother, the Doctor, Rabee' bin Haadee al-Madkhalee to visit this region. **[So that] the one to whom certain matters are not apparent may come to know that our brother, may Allaah grant us and him success, is upon Salafiyyah, the way of the Salaf. And I do not mean here that Salafiyyah is a hizb (party) which is set up to oppose the Muslims outside of it, but I mean by Salafiyyah, that he (i.e. Shaikh Rabee') is upon the path of the Salaf in his Manhaj.**

**Especially in the field of actualising Tawheed and throwing aside what opposes this [manhaj].** And all of us know that Tawheed is the basis for which Allaah sent the Messengers upon them be peace and prayers..." (Cassette: "Ittihaaf al-Kurraam Bi Liqaa al-Uthaimeen Ma'a Rabee al-Madhkhalee wa Muhammad al-Imaam")

Qutubite theoreticians, Bannaawites and Shurocrats collectively attempted to discredit this book which demolished their doctrine, their agenda, and their plots and plans for the Ummah – but all of that ended in vain, and they were but humiliated and disgraced therein and all praise is due to Allaah.

### **Closing Remarks**

So this then was the sophistry of Ahl ul-Ahwaa, the Enemies of the Narrations, the Abandoners of the Sunan, the Deserters of the Prophetic Methodology, in their bid to replace Sunnah with Bid'ah and to replace the Imaams and Mashaayikh of Ahl us-Sunnah with the Imaams of Bid'ah and Zandaqah. The Imaam, Shaikh ul-Islaam, Muhaddith and Faqeeh, al-Albaani was placed in the league of al-Bootee and Jahm ibn Safwaan and the Mu'tadi', Raafidee Heretic, Mukaffir of Banu Umayyah, Reviler of Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu), Mocker of Moosaa (alaihis-salaam), Sayyid Qutb was placed in the league of the Shaikhs of Islaam, Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab and Ibn Taymiyyah and the "Imaams of Guidance"(!).

## **She Accused Me With Her Own Iniquities...**

The poet stated, “*She accused me of her own iniquities and then slowly slipped away*”, and this is indeed the case of Ahl ul-Bid’ah of all generations.

Do you not see, O Sunni, how the Jahmiyyah accused Ahl us-Sunnah of being Mushabbihah. Yet, in truth they were the Mushabbihah because when they heard or read the texts mentioning the Sifaat (Divine Attributes), their hearts likened them and their minds perceived a kaifiyyah (nature, form) for them and they understood them in a manner that only befits the creation. Then their hearts rejected this and they went on to either performed, ta’teel (negation) or tahreef (distortion) of the Attributes. Then whoever opposed them was labelled an Anthropomorphist (Mushabbih). However, the deviation and sickness was actually in their hearts, but they accused Ahl us-Sunnah with it.

And this is the case with the Qutubites, Hardened Bannaawites and Shurocratic Hardliners. For they accused Ahl us-Sunnah of being “Murji’ah, Khawaarij, Raafidah and Qadariyyah”, and in truth, these are their own iniquities, not those of Ahl us-Sunnah. So we say – intending to tighten the noose around the neck of Bid’ah and Qutubiyyah – seeking in all of that the aid and assistance of Allaah, the Most High:

## **Murji’ah with the Innovators, Mockers of the Prophets and Revilers of the Caliphs**

In al-Asaalah magazine (vol. 24) The much-celebrated and world-renowned expert Qutubologist, the Ibn Ma’een of the Era, carrier of the flag of al-Jarh wat-Ta’del, and thorn in the throat of the heretical partisans - may Allaah sever them, Shaikh Rabee’ Ibn Haadee, commented upon the words of the Noble Imaam and Muhaddith, Shaikh al-Albaani in relation to a newly-arisen, foolish-minded generation whom he had labelled the “Khawarij of the Era” due to their having “opposed many of the issues of methodology of the salaf”.

Shaikh Rabee’, the initiator and champion of the Qutubi Inquisition, noted that the opposition to these issues of methodology are indicative of great deviation, one which is more severe than that of the very first Khawarij whom the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) warned against.

The Shaikh noted four particular arenas of deviation of this newly-arisen group:

- 1) Their war against Ahl us-Sunnah and making the people flee from their books, cassettes, and also their severe hatred and enmity towards the carriers of the Salafi da’wah.
- 2) Their excessive love and loyalty for the People of Innovation, and their promotion of false methodologies, and their filling their books with heresies, all of which has an evil effect upon the youth of the Ummah and leads them to takfeer and destructive ways and means.

- 3) Their desires have led them and their followers to fall into extremist Irjaa' which results in the belittlement of the greatest of innovations and the innovations that lead to or comprise kufr - and all of this has weakened the perception of the youth and their concern and jealousy for the religion and for the carriers of this religion, from amongst the Sahaabah and those who followed them. Rather, it has even led them to belittle the affair of the mockery of the Prophets of Allaah.
- 4) Their desires have led them to set up false and innovated methodologies aimed at defending the Innovators and promoting their books and ideals, foremost amongst them the principle of al-Muwaazanah (mentioning the good points alongside the bad points) - all of which lead to the destruction of the Sunnah, and especially the science of al-Jarh wat-Ta'deel.

The Shaikh then supplicated to Allaah that He saves the youth from the evil of this newly-arisen generation and its evil effects in the life of this world and the Hereafter.

Finally, the Shaikh noted that it is more worthy that they be called **"the Extremist Murji'ah of the Era"** before they are called **"the Khawaarij of the Era"**.

And this notification is from the angle that the Murji'ah claimed that sins do not harm in the presence of Imaan, but as for the view of these newly-arisen, foolish-minded ones, then **"sins do not harm in the presence of hizbiyyah or talk of haakimiyyah"**, so if you mock the Prophets of Allaah, make takfir of the Sahaabah, curse Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu) and call for the abolition of parts of the Islamic Sharee'ah with the claim that it does not suit the times, and call for the adoption of Marxist Socialism, then all of this will not harm your Imaan, so long as you explain the meaning of the kalimah to be 'al-haakimiyyah' embodied, or merely believe in your heart and pronounce with your tongue that "there is none which has the right to legislation but Allaah".

And as long as this belief of the heart and speech of the tongue is present then you are guaranteed Paradise and forgiveness for all sins - whatever your actions - absolutely and unconditionally, and it is not necessary for you to make the exception of having perfect Imaan (i.e. Istithnaa) or making it for someone for whom it is claimed that he died as a shaheed (martyr). And all of this no doubt, is extremist and repugnant Irjaa'.

And this is the lot of the Qutubites, Hardened Bannaawites and Shurocratic Hardliners for whom it was sufficient humiliation and ignominy that they defended, aggrandised and showed loyalty for the Mukaffir of the Companions, the Reviler of Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu), the Mocker of Moosaa (alaihis-salaam) and so on. So in reality, it is they who are the Murji'ah in truth, and it is the Ikhwaan ul-Muslimoon who are the Murji'ah in truth, and the Tabligh are Murji'ah in truth, who belittle the affairs of Shirk and Innovation, and it is Hizb ut-Tahrir who are Murji'ah in truth, who abandon all of the outward actions of goodness, until even the prayer - and all of this is fine with Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, nay, there is nothing but **"goodness"** in all of this, and any attempt to root out these sects and groups is **"destruction"** in his demented view, as has already preceded from him in what we have quoted from his words earlier in this discourse.



So they are the Murji'ah in truth walhamdulillaah. Their actions prove this, their doctrines prove this, and their loyalty (walaa) and disownment (baraa') for the sake of the Innovators and Heretics prove this.

And it is for this reason that you now see them listing all of those Shaikhs who were imprisoned for speaking about "al-Haakimiyyah" and asking for "total Sharee'ah rule", and this is in the land where the greatest of Shirk is rampant – Egypt – there you have the graves of Badawai, Sinjar, Tusuqi, Zainab, Hussain and others, where the Greater Shirk takes place – so you see some of the Qutubites illustrating that all of the Scholars who spoke of "al-Haakimiyyah" were either imprisoned, tortured or went missing. And yet amongst these scholars they mention are perhaps those who are Ash'aree and those who are people of Tasawwuf and other than that. So they made al-Haakimiyyah the principle requirement of Imaan, and did not care what else a person may have with him of Innovation. So again, this proves that they are the Murji'ah.

And we do not condone the evil of those in authority, or any tyranny and oppression, but we do hate the emergence of repugnant Irjaa' in this particular manner – claiming to call for Haakimiyyah, and yet throwing it besides one's back when it actually comes to one's Methodology in calling to Allaah and bringing true rectification to the Ummah, that is by way of the call to Tawheed and the Sunnah.

When Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen gave his verdict on the forbiddance of using the word "shaheed" absolutely<sup>20</sup>, al-Awdah gave his verdict on its permissibility. And likewise al-Hawali referred to Sayyid Qutb, as "the Shaheed, Sayyid Qutb" and he did not make the exception. And all of this is blameworthy and repugnant Irjaa'. So they are the Murji'ah in truth – and refuge is from Allaah. They tried to accuse Ahl us-Sunnah (like Imaam al-Albaani and his students) of propounding Irjaa' theoretically – and this was a great lie – yet they, the Activists, were already upon this repugnant Irjaa' practically, their actions all but testifying to this reality.

---

<sup>20</sup> 'Abdur-Rahman bin Mahdi – may Allah have mercy upon him – said, *"The basis of Irja' is to not except oneself (or others from having perfect iman or from being guaranteed Paradise etc.)"* Reported by al-Khallaal in as-Sunnah (1061), al-Aajurree in ash-Sharee'ah (p.139) and others. Something similar is also reported by Ibn Shahn in al-Kitab al-Latif (16) and al-Lalikaa'ee in Usul ul-I'tiqad (1835).

It is not permissible to state "Shaheed So and So" without adding to that, "Inshaa'allaah", since this is in opposition to the Sunnah and is the way of the Murji'ah. Imaam Bukhari included a chapter in the 'Book of Jihad' in his Sahih entitled, "Chapter: It is not to be said, so and so is a Shaheed", and Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen gave a fatwaa in this regard, quoting from Imaam al-Bukhaaree and also stating, "It is not permissible to testify for a specific individual that he is a shaheed, even if he had been killed while performing jihad against the disbelievers. This is because this implication of this testimony is that Paradise has been testified for him, and testification for Paradise is not permissible except for those whom the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) has given testimony for. However it can be said, "It is hoped that he is amongst the Shuhadaa"...As for when is one resolved and says "He is a Shaheed", then this is unlawful, haraam. It is not lawful to say this because this is from the matters of the unseen..." (Alfaadh wa Mafaahim Fee Meezaan il-Islam, p.18).

## **Khawarij with the Sinners, the General Body of Muslims, its Rulers and Nation States**

And this is a matter that we do not need to go into detail, for we have already made note in this discourse and other than it that they are the Khawaarij in truth, and the Muhaddith of the Era called them, “the Khawaarij of the Era”, due to their performance of takfir of the Sinners, let alone the general body of the Muslims, its Rulers and whole nation states – and their following in the footsteps of the Khawaarij in their calls for “Social Justice” and their calls for reform and the particular manner in which all of that was carried out, both theoretically and practically.

As for takfir of the Sinners then refer to “Elementary Qutubism” (GRV070003) for more details, and as for takfir of nation states and Muslim societies then refer to “Intermediate Qutubism” (GRV070004)<sup>21</sup>.

Imaam al-Albaani was asked about the book, “Dhahiratul-Irjaa fil-Fikr al-Islami” of Safar al-Hawali, and in this book takfir is performed on account of certain sins! He replied: “I gave my viewpoint on a matter about thirty or so years ago when I used to be in the [Isamic] University (of Madinah) and I was asked in a gathering about my opinion on Jamaa’at ut-Tabligh. So I said on that day, ‘They are the Sufis of this era’. And now it has occurred to me that I should say about this Jamaa’ah who have emerged in the present times and who have opposed the Salaf, I say here, in accordance with the statement of al-Hafidh adh-Dhahabi: **They have opposed the Salaf in much of the issues of manhaj, and it is befitting that I label them the Khawarij of the era.** And this resembles their emergence at the current time – in which we read their statements – because they, in reality, **their words**

---

<sup>21</sup> Salman Awdah said in his cassette, “Jalsah ala ar-Rasif” about the singer who openly commits fisq, “Allaah will not forgive him! Unless he repents, because the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) ruled that he will not be forgiven [saying] ‘All of my Ummah will be forgiven’ ...! **This is because they are apostates [murtaddoon] due to this act of theirs!... This is apostasy from Islam!! This one will abide eternally in the fire** – and refuge is with Allaah -, unless he repents!! Why? This is because they do not believe in the saying of Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, “And do not come near to zina (fornication or adultery), verily it is an obscenity and an evil way indeed” Allaah is watchful over you! The one who acknowledges that zina is unlawful and an obscenity and which angers Allaah, would he then boast (about his sin) in front of the people?! In front of millions, or many thousands of people?! ... A believer would never do this!...” (Cassette: Jalsah ala ar-Rasif)

And about the singers who distribute their cassettes amongst the youth and which invite the youth to lowly acts, he says, **“I am at perfect ease (of conviction) that the one who does this, the least that can be said about him is that he belittles sin. And there is no doubt that belittling sin – especially when it is a major sin and its unlawfulness is agreed upon – is disbelief (kufr) in Allaah. So there is no doubt concerning the likes of these people that this act of theirs is apostasy from Islaam. I say this and my heart is tranquil and at perfect ease with it”** (Cassette: Ash-Shabaab, As’ilah wa Mushkilaat).

For more details of the takfir of the sinners performed by the likes of Safar al-Hawali, Salman al-Awdah, Muhammad Suroor and Nasir al-Umar and their falling into the manhaj of the Khawaarij refer to book “al-Ajwibah al-Mufidah” which is a compilation of the fataawaa of Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan on the issues of manhaj, with some excellent notes and comments by Jamaal bin Farihaan al-Haaritheeh. Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan checked through the whole book and corroborated the contents, as well as the additional explanatory footnotes.

**take the direction and objective of that of the Khawarij in performing takfir of the one who commits major sins. And perhaps I should say, this is either due to ignorance on their behalf or due to devised plot!!**" (The Cassette: The Surooriyyah are the Khawarij of the Era, end of the first side. Dated 17th Dhul-Hijjah 1417H.)

And Shaikh Muhammad Amaan al-Jaamee in his famous open advice to Safar al-Hawaali, stated, **"What is all this tumult about the Salafi Aqidah?!... You preach the Salafi doctrine in theory and then you call to the doctrine of the Khawaarij practically?!..."** (Cassette: Naseehah Ilaa Safar al-Hawaali).

However, we say the truth of the matter is that the unfortunate doctor who neither knew the reality of Irjaa' and nor the great Imaam whom he accused with it, called to the doctrine of the Khawaarij both theoretically and practically, and we have already outlined this in what has preceded.

Similarly, they are Khawaarij with our Scholars – and we mean here that they attack our scholars and claim that they are "paid workers" and "spies" and so on, and some of them go to extremes and make takfir of our Scholars, and yet others "make excuses" for them because these scholars are merely weighing the harms and benefits in what they say and do, and because they fear for their lives and so on – but all of this is actually an attack and defamation of the honour of our Scholars – we mean here the Saudi Mashaayikh. So they vary in their sayings, some of them say the scholars are hypocrites, others say they are spies who desire monetary gain, and others say they are controlled and in difficult circumstances and so on. But all of it is evil.

And what has occurred from Salman al-Awdah, Mohammad Suroor, Mohammad Qutb, Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and other than them all proves that they are indeed the Khawaarij of our times... *She accused me of her own iniquities and then slowly slipped away(!)*.

### **Raafidah Towards the Messengers of Allaah and their Companions**

Ibn al-Qayyim says in his book Haadi ul-Arwaah ilaa Bilaad il-Afraah: "And we shall quote their concensus (i.e. that of the Salaf) just as Harb, the companion of Imaam Ahmad, has quoted from them in his own wording in his well known al-Masaa'il. He said: "This is the madhhab of the People of Knowledge, the Ashaabul-Athar (People of the Narrations), Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah, those who stick fast to it [Ahl us-Sunnah] and who seek to guide themselves by [them i.e. the Ahl us-Sunnah] from among those in the presence of the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) up until this day of ours. And I met whomever I met from among the Scholars of the people of Hijaaz and Shaam and others besides them. **Whoever differs with and opposes a single matter from the madhaahib [of these People of Knowledge] or contests and defames them or criticises the one who speaks [by what they speak with], then he is a mukhaalif (opposer), a mubtadi' (an innovator) and one who has left the Jamaa'ah, who has ceased to be upon the manhaj of the Sunnah and the Path of Truth.**

And this [i.e. the path of the People of Knowledge] is the madhhab of Ahmad, Ishaq bin Ibraaheem, Abdullaah bin Zubair al-Humaidee, Sa'eed bin Mansoor and others besides them amongst those with whom we have sat and taken knowledge from..." And then he lists the points of their aqeedah, amongst them: "...And the mentioning of the good qualities and deeds of the Companions of the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and refraining from mentioning their shortcomings and mistakes, those which occurred between them. **Whoever reviles the Companions of the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), or a single one amongst them, or reduces [their worth and status] or insults them or exposes their faults or criticises a single one amongst them then he is a mubtadi' (an innovator), a raafidee (an extreme shi'ite), a khabeeth (vile and repugnant) and a mukhaalif (an opposer) and Allaah will not accept from him any of his efforts nor his fair dealings. Rather loving them is a sunnah, supplicating for them is nearness (Allaah), taking them as a model for guidance is a means (of nearness to Allaah) and accepting and taking from their narrations is an excellence.**"

Ibn al-Qayyim referred here, to Harb bin Ismaa'eel al-Kirmaanee (one of the companions of Imaam Ahmad) who summarised the creed of the Ahl us-Sunnah. This creed is contained in the book: "Masaa'il Harb bin Ismaa'eel al-Kirmaanee an il-Imaam Ahmad", regarding which adh-Dhahabee (d. 748H) said: "It is one of the most precious of the books of the Hanaabilah."

And they are the Raafidah in truth, O Sunni, for how eager they are to defend the Raafidee, Sayyid Qutb. Indeed Allaamah Mahmood Shaakir refuted this Innovator in numerous open discourses, but Sayyid Qutb showed nothing but refusal, continuing to publish his book of revilement and abuse "Social Justice" until his death. There is no doubt that Sayyid Qutb was a Raafidee Heretic, by consensus of the madhaahib of the People of Knowledge. And we were but opposed by the Ahl ul-Ahwaa in this consensus, and they attacked us and defamed us and reviled us – for defending the honour and integrity of the Prophets of Allaah, and the Caliphs of Islaam and the Companions of Allaah's Messenger.

So it is they who are Raafidah in truth, for their loyalty and disownment is for the sake of a Raafidee Heretic, and their brand of al-Haakimiyyah does not apply to their own mentors and leaders, rather it is only for the Rulers, Scholars and the Sinners and none else. Not for the Innovators and the Wandering Strayers, those who perform tabdeel of the Deen of Allaah, such as al-Qaradawi and many of the Innovators of Ikhwaan – those who call for unity with the Raafidah Shi'ites, upon them be the curse of Allaah. The Ikhwaan want unity between the Raafidah, nay, even between the Infidels.

And then there comes the likes of Salman al-Awdah and Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq defending and aggrandising the Ikhwaan and the Raafidee Heretic who uttered apostasy in his mockery of our Prophet and Messenger, Moosaa (alaihis-salaam) and who made takfir of Banu Umayyah and who ridiculed Uthmaan (radiallaahu anhu) and who accused some amongst the companions of "treachery", "dishonesty", "nifaaq" and other than that –and refuge is from Allaah. So they are the Raafidah in truth and Ahl us-Sunnah are free from

this slander, and indeed **Allaah defends those who believe** (with the belief of Ahl us-Sunnah) – may Allaah make us amongst them and cause us to remain steadfast therein, and may he protect us from the *fitan* of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, Salmaan al-Awdah and Safar al-Hawaali and other than them who caused Ahl us-Sunnah to fall into dissension and dispute and wicked hizbiyyah.

### **Qadariyyah Towards the Divine and Prophetic Methodology in Calling to Allaah and the Establishment of His Authority upon the Earth**

And in truth, it is they who are Qadariyyah – and this is because they have abandoned the Methodology of the Prophets, and the tongue of their disposition states that this methodology “supports the New World Order” and that it is “defeatism” and “leniency” and does not bring about the desired rectification and that it merely “supports the thrones of the tyrants” and so on.

They abandoned the Prophetic Methodology and took to the Innovated methodologies, which they but acquired from Ahl ul-Bid'ah. They thought that entrance into democracy and parliamentary elections and activities and political work (albeit within an apparatus and structure they themselves consider to be kufr, since they do not hold that there is any nation state which is wholly and completely Islamic), and also rebelling against the Rulers, and uniting all the Ahl ul-Bid'ah into one lump for these types of activities will bring about the desired results. And this on their behalf, is a rejection of the Divine Promise – which is actually based upon Tasfiyah and Tarbiyah (Purification and Cultivation), and which is mentioned by Imaam Maalik in his famous statement, “The latter part of this Ummah will not be rectified except by that which rectified its earlier part”. They are those whose nature and condition is described by the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) in his statement to al-Khabbaab Ibn al-ArRaat, “**Indeed you are a hasty people**”, and this was after he informed Khabbaab about the trials that the people of past faced when they called to Tawheed, and how Allaah will certainly complete this affair (i.e. establish Islaam), but that they (meaning the Muslims) are a hasty people. And all of this because the Muslims merely asked the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) to supplicate to Allaah because they were being oppressed by the Mushriks(!!).

And this is what we call to, we consider that the trials of the Ummah are due to its own iniquities, due to its being far from Tawheed and the Sunnah – and this is all but evident to anyone who has a shred of intellectual capacity and who has faculties of sense and perception that actually work. And as for the various punishments and humiliations that the Ummah is going through then that is a punishment from Allaah. And we distinguish between what is a cause, and what is a symptom. We believe that the cause for our current condition is our being far from Tawheed and the Sunnah, that is on a collective, global level. And we hold that what we are afflicted by of oppression, whether by way of the Infidels or by way of those given authority over us by Allaah, the Rulers – whom we hold to be between either kufr, dhulm or fisq, depending on their beliefs and actions – and also what we have of economic, material and political weakness, then we hold that all of those are the symptoms of a deeper underlying cause (or causes).

And we hold that calling the Ummah to Jihaad, as a starting point in the da'wah, or calling them to partake in democracy or parliamentary activity or political work, as a starting point in the da'wah, or by trying to correct the Rulers by force and by political activism, or by takfir and khurooj (rebellion) as a starting point in the da'wah, or to call all the groups and sects of innovation to come together and perform "collective work" as a starting point in the da'wah – we hold all of that to be erroneous and in opposition to the Methodology of the Prophets.

It must be noted that we do not reject that Jihaad will continue till the Hour is established, and this is the Fard Kifaayah Jihaad, which can be performed any time, any where, by small bands of individuals for the defence of Muslim lands, and which does not require the overall leader of the Muslims to be present. And likewise, we do not reject that the Rulers are to be corrected, but it must be done by the correct methodology and the prescribed Sharee'ah way. And likewise, we do not reject that in some cases, the Scholars may allow the Muslims to partake in elections to remove the greater of two evils – but they do not encourage them to become actively involved in the political process and to become political parties and to take seats in Parliament and so on, as a matter of methodology. And likewise, we do not reject "collective work", but upon the Sharee'ah principles and upon correct Manhaj.

So when our Mashaayikh and Imaams clarified all of these issues, they accused us of negating Jihaad, forbidding political work, being lenient with the Rulers, and rejecting co-operation and so on, because these had become either goals in themselves or the most fundamental ways and means for the biased partisans, and so they accused us of being Qadariyyah, because we – in their claim – "denied" that we have to "work" and "fight qadr with another qadr" and so on. And in reality, Satan the Accursed had beguiled them, as he had beguiled many groups before them. For they left the Methodology of the Prophets and replaced it with innovated matters, in methodology and da'wah.

So unfortunately, the Qutubites, Shurocrats and Hardened Bannaawites have taken all of these issues, made them the most important elements in the rectification of the Ummah in current times, then made these issues those around which their religion revolves, and then they accused those who did not agree with them to be deniers of Jihaad, deniers of political work, and deniers of the Haakimiyyah of Allaah(!).

Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan stated, **"Thus it is necessary for these groups to correct their concepts and understanding, by referring back to the Book and the Sunnah, in order to know the methodology of the Messengers in calling to Allaah.** For indeed Allaah - the One free from all imperfections - informed that correct rule and sovereignty, which is the central part of the call of the former jamaa 'ah whom we mentioned, **cannot be achieved except after correcting aqeedah, such that all worship is for Allaah alone and worship of everything else is abandoned.** Allaah - the Most High - says:

**Allaah has promised to those amongst you who truly have Imaan (true faith and belief)**

**and act in obedience to Allaah and His Messenger, that He will grant them rulership upon the earth, just as He granted it to those before them, and that He will establish their Religion for them and grant them the authority to practice their Religion which He chose and ordered them with. And He will certainly change their situation to one of security, after their fear. Providing that they worship and obey Me, not associating anything else in worship with Me. Then, whoever rejects this favour by disobedience to their Lord - then they are the rebellious transgressors. Soorah an-Noor 24:55**

**So these people wish to establish the Islaamic State before purifying the lands of idolatrous beliefs which take the form of worship of the dead, and devotion to the tombs - such as is no different to the worship of al-Laat, al-Uzzaa and the third of them Manaat, rather it is worse. So they are attempting that which is impossible...** (Introduction to 'Manhaj ul-Anbiyaa' of Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee).

And when our Ulamaa, the likes of Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee authored works in this regard, on the issue of the correct way to reform the Ummah, the Qutubites, Hardened Shurocrats, Bannaawites all showed severe rejection against his book and claimed he had "emptied Tawheed" – a mighty lie and fabrication. Indeed, he was praised by all of the senior Ulamaa for his efforts in this regard – and the saying of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen has already preceded **"that he (i.e. Shaikh Rabee') is upon the path of the Salaf in his Manhaj. Especially in the field of actualising Tawheed and throwing aside what opposes this [manhaj]."** And all of us know that Tawheed is the basis for which Allaah sent the Messengers upon them be peace and prayers..." (Cassette: "Ittihaaf al-Kurraam Bi Liqaa al-Uthaimen Ma'a Rabee al-Madkhalee wa Muhammad al-Imaam")

And this enraged them and *janna junoonuhum* (their madness increased). This is what proves that they in truth are the Qadariyyah. This is because they abandoned the ways and means that Allaah had prescribed in rectification of the Ummah and bringing back power and authority to the Islamic Ummah – claiming that all of that is defeatism and leniency – and they adopted the ways and means that we had outlined before. They accused those who did not agree with them as being the "Sitters and Waiters", meaning those who accept the current status-quo and who say we can do nothing and so we might as well "sit and wait" till the Mahdee arrives. This is how they belittled the da'wah of Ahl us-Sunnah and this is how they ridiculed the Methodology of the Prophets. While Ahl us-Sunnah stood to treat the underlying causes – they merely treated the symptoms, and that thought that they were the doctors in truth and the true rectifiers, whereas in reality they were the sick men of the Ummah, needing the treatment of the Book, the Sunnah and the Salaf of the Ummah.

Symptoms may be treated but they will come back again if the underlying causes for the disease are not eliminated. This is why we hold that the Qutubites, Shurocrats and Hardened Bannaawites only see the outer things of life of this world – that is the symptoms – and they are blind to the Hereafter. Meaning, that what guarantees Paradise in the Hereafter is Tawheed and the Sunnah – regardless of whether an Islamic State exists or not, regardless of whether total Sharee'ah rule exists or not. So they tried to treat the

symptoms and forgot the cause – and hence, played fast and loose with the welfare of the people in the Hereafter.

Pay attention to understand why. They attempted to treat the symptoms and they but left the cause (or causes) present, in full force. In fact they made the causes even stronger and even more firmly established(!). So they began to say that in the splitting and sectarianism that exists today, there is nothing but manifest goodness and so on... so they do not discourage what the sects are upon of splitting and differing and what the Islamic groups of today are upon of Shirk and Innovation and they co-operate with them in parliamentary work and political work. They hate that Ahl us-Sunnah should refute them – this is why they call Ahl us-Sunnah “Raafidah with the Islamic Groups”. And they promoted the old and outdated verdicts of the scholars which allowed co-operation with these groups. But as for the new and most-recent verdicts of the Scholars in which they forbid working with these groups – because the true realities have become clear to the Scholars and because of the misguidance and Shirk and Innovation present in these groups – then they either hide them or hate that they are distributed and spread. And this was the way of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq as has preceded and also the way of Salmaan al-Awdah, both of whom innovated into the religion in order to defend the straying and deviant groups and parties, all in the guise of “collective work”.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> The Permanent Committee of Scholars was asked, “Based upon the Saying of Allaah, the Most High: **“Help you one another in al-Birr and at-Taqwaa, but do not help one another in sin and transgression.”** Soorah al-Maaidah (5):2, It is said that it is obligatory to co-operate with all of the Islamic Jamaa’ahs, even though they differ with us with regard to methodologies and their way in giving dawah. So Jamaaatut-Tableegh has a way of giving dawah different to the way of the Ikhwaanul-Muslimeen and Hizbut-Tahreer and Jamaa’atul-Jihaad and the Salafees. So how is this co-operation to be? And is it restricted for example to joint participation in conferences and gatherings? And what is to be the case when dawah is being given to non-Muslims, since confusion may be caused in the minds of new Muslims by the fact that each Jamaa’ah from these Jamaa’ahs will direct them to their own centres and their own scholars, which will confuse them. So how will it be possible to avert this matter?”

**The Committee of Major Scholars replied: “What is obligatory is to co-operate with the Jamaa’ah that proceeds upon the manhaj (methodology) of the Book and the Sunnah and that which the Salaf of the Ummah were upon in calling to the Tawheed of Allaah, the One free of all imperfections, and making worship purely and sincerely for Him, and warning against shirk and innovations and sins, and to advise the Jamaa’ahs that are contrary to that.**

**So if they return to what is correct, then they are to be co-operated with. But if they persist upon being contrary then it is obligatory to keep away from them and to adhere to the Book and the Sunnah.** Then co-operation with the Jamaa’ah that adheres to the manhaj (methodology) of the Book and the Sunnah will be upon everything that is good, righteousness and obedience to Allaah whether gatherings, conferences, lessons or lectures and in everything containing benefit for Islaam and the Muslims.” (Fatwaa no. 18870 dated 11/6/1417H ).

And this was how Ahl us-Sunnah proceeded, co-operating with others based only upon their adherence to the Manhaj of the Book and the Sunnah and that which the Salaf were upon in da’wah, while refraining from co-operation with the groups and sects of Innovation. But this was not pleasing to the Qutubites, Shurocrats and Hardened Bannaawites.



So in belittling the affair of the Innovators and justifying the existence and the legality of the multiplicity of groups (all with different creeds and methodologies, such as Tabligh, Ikhwaan and Hizb ut-Tahrir), the Activists indeed played fast and loose with the welfare of Muslims in the Hereafter. This is why we say, they only know the outer things in life (like Shurocacy, Bolshevite Rehearsals, seeking the thrones of power and authority and other affairs) and of [what truly brings success for the Muslims in] the Hereafter, they are heedless.

And all of this proves that they are the Qadariyyah, that they are “**a hasty people**” who do not trust the Divine Methodology, who do not adopt it and who in fact warned against it when the Mashaayikh of Ahl us-Sunnah propounded it and clarified it, such as Shaikh Rabee' and others. So they are the Qadariyyah in truth ... *She accused me of her own iniquities and then slowly slipped away(!)*.

### Summary

In closing it is important to note, that when we say that they are Murji'ah, Khawaarij, Raafidah and Qadariyyah, then we distinguish between making judgements upon individuals and between making judgement upon them in general terms, and upon the methodology that they are upon. For individuals amongst them may have their share of refuting the people of Innovation (such as the Soofees, Asharee's, the extreme amongst the Ikhwaan and others), or calling to Tawheed, or teaching it, and they may detest what is with Sayyid Qutb of repugnant heresies – however, they are caught up in the doctrines and innovated principles of the Qutubites, Shurocrats and Hardened Bannawites, and they have become affected by their call. So we do not make what we have said above absolute and illustrative of each and every individual affected by them – since the state and condition of each individual will vary, and their will be different extremes amongst them, ranging from mild *hawaa* to strong powerful *hawaa*, however, for the sum-total of what they are upon, as a group, and as a methodology, the above observations hold true.

It is now time for us to proceed and to take some lessons from the Morgan Scandal which was perpetrated in the last ten days of Ramadaan, 1421H.

## A Dialogue with Salim Morgan

### Introduction

All of what has preceded in our discourse was actually a precursor to what is to follow in clarifying numerous comments that were made by Salim Morgan over the last 10 days of Ramadan.

On the night of Saturday 13<sup>th</sup> Ramadaan (i.e. Friday night), one from the neo-Khawaarij, belonging to the group of al-Takfir wal-Hijrah, a Qutubite, nurtured upon the same thought and ideology expounded by Sayyid Qutb around five decades ago, ran into a Salafi mosque, a mosque belonging to the Ansar us-Sunnah, on the outskirts of Khartoum, Sudan, during Taraaweeth prayers and shot wildly at those in attendance, while they were in prostration. At least twenty were killed and over fifty-five injured.

Following this incident Ahl ul-Hadeeth wal-Athar publicised its details and added some notes concerning the Khawaarij, their thought and ideology, their great danger to the Muslim Ummah and how the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) had described them. It was also stated that this thought and ideology was responsible for much of the turmoil and bloodshed in the Muslim lands in recent times, especially in Syria, Egypt and lately, Algeria. It was explained that the beginnings of this same pattern also emerged in Saudi Arabia, when some of the youth – under the influence of Kharijite figureheads, such as Muhammad Suroor and Muhammad Qutb - began to propound the Qutubite doctrine, and that by the praise of Allaah, it was [temporarily] contained by our Ulamaa.

When these facts were reported, it but enraged the Ahl ul-Ahwaa, the Lords of Adulterated Principles, and they fell into a wicked state of denial and perfidious slander. The first of their slanders which originated from one whose email name is “Ahtaj Nasiha” was that we had claimed or stated or implied that the Qutubite theoreticians that we have discussed in this discourse – namely the likes of Muhammad Suroor, Muhammad Qutb, Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, Safar al-Hawali, Salman al-Awdah, et. al., “condone or encourage or enjoy... the brutal and cold-blooded murder of brothers in Sudan...”.

The perpetrator of this slanderous accusation was not the one whose scandal we are currently discussing, but this laid the way for the utterance of further lies and misrepresentations.

As for what was claimed against us by “Ahtaj Nasiha”, then that is indeed a wicked slander. For firstly, there is no doubt that the doctrine being pushed by the likes of Safar and Salman was the Qutubite doctrine of takfir, haakimiyyah and khurooj. And we had explained that this type of doctrine leads to the type of killing that occurred in Sudan. This is because those who are affected by the Khaarijee thought, begin to sow the seeds for the takfir of those who do not agree to their views, and when this takfir of the Rulers, Scholars and others (such as the persistent sinners) takes root, then the lives of innocent men, women and children become lawful game.

Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said, "And the way, seerah, of the Muslims has never ceased upon this (methodology). They did not declare them (i.e. the Khawarij) to be apostates like those whom as-Siddiq (radiallaahu anhu) fought against. And this despite the command of the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) to fight against them, as occurs in the authentic hadiths, and also despite what has been reported about them in the hadeeth of Abu Umaamah, collected by at-Tirmidhi and others that they are "the most evil of those who are killed under the sky and how excellent is the one killed by them". **Meaning that they are more harmful to the Muslims than others, for there are none which are more harmful to the Muslims than them, neither the Jews and nor the Christians. For they strived to kill every Muslim who did not agree with their view, declaring the blood of the Muslims, their wealth, and the slaying of their children to be lawful, while making takfir of them. And they considered this to be worship, due to their ignorance and their innovation that caused to stray...**" Minhaj us-Sunnah 5/248.

Then secondly, never was it claimed or stated or even implied that those mentioned "condone or encourage or enjoy" the murder of innocent civilians. Rather, this is a wicked slander. It was made clear that the doctrine eventually leads to this kind of activity, and indeed in what is to follow below in our discussion of the Morgan Scandal, this will become clear inshaa'llaah. It was stated that it is the actual doctrine which leads to these kinds of calamities in the Muslim lands. But the brother, filled with overflowing rage and anger, was led to lose his senses and make his wicked slander, alongside many other injustices and lies.

Amongst them his insinuation that "...even the murderous madmen in Algeria are being tied to Salafiyyah...". And this too is a wicked lie, for even the just amongst the Qutubites or those affected by them know that those responsible for the beginnings of the bloodshed were the Qutubites and Political Activists, the Revolutionary Takfeeris themselves. They made takfir of the nation state, and of those who worked or had any association with the government, and also the sinners amongst the men and women, and they made them lawful targets. And the likes of Alee bin Haaj sanctioned this type of activity, after he was imprisoned.<sup>23</sup> And this was the beginnings of the fitan that has since that time, led to the murder of 100,000 .

As for these "madmen" being tied to "Salafiyyah" then perhaps the perpetrator of this insinuation is attempting to achieve is to absolve the Revolutionary Takfiris of blame and of bloodshed and of cold-blooded murder – [the same Revolutionary Takfiris who for a

---

<sup>23</sup> There occurs in the secret letter sent by Alee bin Haaj from prison to those ready for fighting, **"...and the disbelieving authority in Algeria, the most severe and merciless strikes should be made against the security forces, from the point of view of their being part of the authority, not as individuals, also those working for... (part here not legible)... with the required Sharee'ah verification. Likewise, striking the foreigners, such as the French. Also striking the economical [structure] and also the tourists..."**. Letter dated 20/Safar/1415H written in his prison cell no. 9 of the Military Prison Distict. And this is the very same that occurs in the book "Limaadhaa A'damoonee" of Sayyid Qutb. Refer to "Elementary Qutubism" Lesson 4 [A].

decade or so were nurtured upon what was at the same time being propounded by Safar and Salman in Saudi Arabia] - and to then ascribe it instead to "Salafiyyah".

Firstly, the Revolutionary Takfiris also identify themselves with Salafiyyah, yet Salafiyyah is free from them and they from it. They claim they are Salafis and call themselves Salafis. But perhaps this brother ("Ahtaj Nasiha") - in his intense anger was attempting to pass judgement upon "Salafiyyah" and its true adherents... may Allaah return him to his senses.

Then this one actually retreated and after venting his anger did not return, and avowed himself never to return and may Allaah indeed make him return (to the right way)...

It was here that the one called **Salim Morgan** made his debut. We will uncover the finer details of his defamation piecemeal. And it is vitally important that you understand all that has preceded in this discourse to truly understand the depths of his ignorance and the evil in his statements. It is important that you recall the slanders of ash-Shayjee against Ahl us-Sunnah, the false doctrines of Safar, Salman and Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, and their deviation on the issues of methodology.

### **The Opening of the Scandal**

While the one who started this unfortunate chapter retreated after the dissipation of his anger, one who concealed much more, entered onto the stage. As for the first, he vented his anger out of frustration, got things off his chest and left. But as for the newcomer, the perpetrator of the scandal, then he was more devised and calculated.

Stated Morgan:

"Al-hamdu lillahi, behind the one who spoke out are THOUSANDS of good sense and sound iman who agree absolutely. In fact, in the years of inter-salafi fitna instigated by the neos who "claim" to follow Sh. Muqbil, Albaaniy, etc. (may Allah preserve their innocence of the excesses of these youth) all of the violence around the world came from their side. - Salim Morgan"

Morgan began by wholeheartedly agreeing with the iniquity and slanderous, libellous accusations of "Ahtaj Nasiha", and claiming that thousands of others agree absolutely - and these "thousands" are those whom he has never met and does not even know, rather they are just figures which exist in his mind. So all of those fictitious ones also partake in the vicious slander of "Ahtaj Nasiha" in the mental world of Morgan.

But then Morgan reveals his true orientation from the very beginning. He makes reference to the "Neos" and he means here what he understands to be the "Neo-Salafis" and this is the terminology he has inherited from ash-Shayjee, the Arch-Liar and Delusionist. So the first association we make is with ash-Shayjee. And we have already discussed the slanders of ash-Shaayjee in what has preceded.

### **The Inter-Salafi Fitnah**

The lying, sinful forelock then claimed that the “inter-salafi fitnah” was instigated by these “Neos”. And either this forelock made this wicked slander and libellous accusation based upon pure ignorance of the true realities, or out of calculation. For he claims elsewhere that he has been upon the Salafi Manhaj for over 20 years and that he hardly reads any books written after the 10<sup>th</sup> century Hijrah, and mostly those written before the 4<sup>th</sup> century Hijrah. This is what he claimed in the course of his scandal. And he claims that the “inter-salafi fitnah” was instigated by those whom he calls the “Neos”. There is no need to repeat what we have outlined earlier in this discourse about the beginnings of this fitnah that entered into Ahl us-Sunnah, and how it was brought to them by the likes of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, Safar al-Hawali, and Salman al-Awdah, the latter two having been affected by Kharijite figureheads, Muhammad Suroor and Muhammad Qutb, as well as the writings and works of Sayyid Qutb, the most prominent Kharijite theoretician of the last century. Rather, this saying is rejected and thrown back in the face of Morgan... so that he may repent from it and desist from his wicked lie and grievous crime.

For by “Neos” he is but referring to Shaikh Rabee’ bin Haadee al-Madkhalee, who correctly expounded the Methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah, and who correctly propounded the Methodology of the Salaf in criticising groups, movements and men, after it had been adulterated by al-Awdah and Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq. He is but referring to Shaikh Muqbil bin Haadee, and the likes of the Madinan Shaikhs and also the Jordanian Shaikhs, foremost amongst them Imaam al-Albaani, who forbade the “political activity” of the activists, forbade this over-emphasis to Jihaad, because the precursors to the Jihaad that will guarantee Allaah’s aid and assistance were not in place. It is the likes of these who are in truth intended by the term the “Neo-Salafis”. For Ahl us-Sunnah adhered to the way of these Shaikhs and to their clarification of the Salafi Manhaj. It is for this reason that they were labelled “Neo-Salafis”, a mighty slander and wicked forgery.

### **Followers of Imaam al-Albaani and Shaikh Muqbil**

Then in the same breath he exclaims ...”the neos who “claim” to follow Sh. Muqbil, Albaaniy, etc. (may Allah preserve their innocence of the excesses of these youth)...” and so he thinks that the claim of Ahl us-Sunnah that they follow Shaikh Muqbil and Imaam al-Albaani is merely a claim. And perhaps he is merely ignorant of pretending to be ignorant that it was Shaikh Muqbil who uncovered the scandals of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and who advised us personally, yes personally, to flee from Ihya at-Turaath. Perhaps this Jaahil is ignorant of the fact that Shaikh Muqbil was at the forefront of exposing the scandals of Muhammad Suroor. Perhaps he is also ignorant of the fact that when these tribulations occurred we tasked many of our brothers who study with Shaikh Muqbil to bring back answers to our questions on these issues – and so we adhered to the direction and advice of this Noble Shaikh and Muhaddith. And likewise, perhaps he pretends to be ignorant of the saying of Imaam al-Albaani concerning those for whom he has affectations, “the Khawaarij of the Era”, and that they are “reckless newcomers” and that he sought refuge in Allaah from what their “evil of ignorance, misguidance and scum”, and that he described the Kharijite Intellectual Propaganda machine in the form of “Dhaahirat ul-

Irjaa'” as a book that reached “the extremity in evil”. And so we took great lessons and admonitions from his words. We followed his way of Tasfiyah and Tarbiyah, and his way in the rectification of the Ummah not due to blind-following, as the lying, sinful forelock would later claim about us, but because this indeed is the methodology of the Book and the Sunnah.

And then perhaps this Jaahil is ignorant or merely pretends to be ignorant of the saying of Shaikh Muqbil bin Haadee concerning the Salafis of UK, “**From Shaykh Muqbil bin Haadee al-Waadi'ee** (may Allaah preserve him). Dated 1st of Rabee ath-Thaane 1419 after Hijrah. Our Brothers for the sake of Allaah, the Salafees, the brothers at the 'Salafi Bookstore and the Islamic Centre' in the city of Birmingham in Britain are mentioned with righteousness and love for the Sunnah and calling to it and making war against innovations and hizbiyyah (partisanship). ... I hope that our brothers from Ahl us-Sunnah agree to co-operate with them financially and spiritually for they are deserving of that.. Verily, Allaah supports His slave as long as he is in support of his brother. May Allaah protect them, for they are facing the call of Christianity and Atheism and the call to nakedness and unveiling as well as the calls of innovation and hizbiyyah. And they protect their brothers from slipping into corruption, calamity and innovations and other than that from the various types of misguidance. May Allaah grant success for all that He loves and is pleased with. Abu Abdur-Rahmaan Muqbil ibn Haadee al-Waad'iee from Sa'dah in Yemen.” And this was after the visit of one of his foremost students and one of powerful students of knowledge, Shaikh Yahyaa al-Haajjurree.

Then comes Morgan, having already uttered numerous slanders in the same breath, and then he boldly proclaims that Ahl us-Sunnah, the Salafis, the Atharis, are only claimants to the way of al-Albaani and Muqbil. Yes, maybe we do not have their manners and behaviour – and we seek Allaah's aid and assistance in attaining that - but what the lying sinful forelock intends is to portray that we are not followers of their actual methodology and of their Salafi way and doctrine. For there is no other way for Morgan and his likes to prove that we are upon a way other than that of Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam al-Albaani, Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen and the rest of the Salafi Mashaayikh in the issues that the Political Activists had deviated from, except to use “bad manners” and “rudeness” and “harshness” and other such matters as an argument to exclude us from being followers of the Salafi Mashaayikh. And this is the way of all the Lords of Adulterated Principles, Qutubites, Shurocrats, Revolutionary Takfiris, Bannaawites and all their loyalists and supporters. This is their way. For from knowledge-based discussions and referring back to the words of the Ulamaa in these issues they indeed flee. They flee like a lion. And then, with sheer irony, they are the ones who display wicked and evil manners.

And this is why in the discussion that ensued, Morgan never once dared to comment or discuss the scores of narrations and quotations that were presented to him from the Salafi Imaams and Mashaayikh on these issues. He fled from that and instead took to sarcasm.

### **Violence Came From the Salafis? The “Defeatist, Lenient” Ones?**

And then he utters one of the greatest of his vicious, immoral and profligate slanders. He barked (in vain) “... all of the violence around the world came from their (i.e. “the Salafis”) side.”

Now what exactly does he mean. What violence. Where? When? This is the way of Morgan. To talk so generally that he cannot be pinpointed. To avoid finer details so that his corruption and degeneracy cannot be isolated and quarantined. And this was his way in the rest of the discussion. And he boldly claims “around the world” making great the lie, and severe the iniquity.

There is no doubt that this is indeed a vicious slander and a mighty forgery for which he will have to answer on the Day of Judgement. He claims that “in the years of inter-salafi fitna ... all of the violence around the world came from their side.”

Did the violence in Algeria come from the direction of the Salafis? Those who did not indulge in takfir and khurooj and who called for patient reserve, and who did not believe that partaking in the elections was the correct thing to do. Those who adhered to the advice of the three Imaams, al-Albaani, Ibn Baz and Ibn Uthaimeen<sup>24</sup>. Those who rejected the prattling and the analysis of Safar and Salman and instead adhered to the way of the Salaf and the madhhab of Ahl us-Sunnah. Those who themselves were butchered and slaughtered because they did not agree to the views and ways of the Revolutionary Takfiris?! Indeed the book “Madaarik un-Nadhar” uncovered the great scandals of the Revolutionary Takfiris and of the Political Activists. And this is why all Qutubites and Biased-Partisans have such an intense hatred for it. The book that was praised by Imaam al-Albaani, the very one who labelled the Activists as “the Khawaarij of the Era”.

Stated Shaikh Abdul-Malik ar-Ramadaanee in this book that is the annoying thorn in the throat of the Innovators, Madaarik un-Nadhar Fis-Siyaasah (pp.357-358, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), “...Just as they (the revolutionary takfiris of Algeria) had murdered many of the leading scholars, despite the fact that they had no involvement whatsoever with political activity, not even the slightest bit! And as for threatening the Salafi Du’aat with death, then this is only too famous and known to be worthy of mention. And Allaah alone is the One sought for help against what you describe the Algerian Salvation Front with, that it is Salafiyyah, O Salmaan!...Indeed they made lawful the blood of those Salafi Du’aat because they did not join the Front and nor did they believe in Hizbiyyah (partisanship). And then many of them were slaughtered until one of them could not even pray Fajr, Maghrib or Ishaah in the mosque out of the fear of being assassinated. A person would not fear the soldiers of the government as he would from the soldiers of the brethren in Islaam!! Until one of them said, “We have become like the Hypocrites in our abandonment of Fajr and Ishaah’ in Jamaa’ah!” They (the revolutionary takfiris) prevented them from teaching the religion to the people, and yet others they slaughtered, because they did not participate with them in

---

<sup>24</sup> Refer to Intermediate Qutubism (GRV070004) in the section “Important Principles” to read their advice, and to learn how severe and unjust is this wicked slander of the lying, sinful forelock of Morgan.

the slaughtering of the (tribe of) Bu Sulaimaanee and the Salafi Du'aat and Khutubaa' such as Muhammad al-Ameen al-Jalfaawee, and Abbaas Tayyiboon in the city of Bal-Abbaas, and also the Khateeb 'Abdul-Qaadir Mukhtaaree... and there are many others besides them. And to this day, the Salafis keep falling (i.e. are killed) at the hands of those, one after another. And they also killed the women who did not cover themselves up properly, they did this so it would be a lesson to other women!! And likewise those who were employed in state and government bodies (such as customs, tax offices and so on) were threatened with death if they went to their workplaces. And it is also strange that those who worked in the Military in order to fulfil what was called "the national duty" were also killed by this Jamaa'ah (i.e. the revolutionary takfiris) without first being asked to repent (istitaabah), even if they were actually compelled (to work with the Military)...."

Then there comes this wicked, lying, sinful forelock and claims that the "Neos" were responsible for all the violence around the world(!). May Allaah silence him and his likes...

In the early 1990s Shaikh Jameel ur-Rahmaan as-Salafi, the one who was the first to establish the Jihaad (that is the correct Jihaad upon the correct methodology) was murdered by a degenerate Ikhwaani Qutubi with three shots to the head, in his own house, shortly after the ahzaab (the various factions) of bid'ah and hizbiyyah plotted to remove the Salafis, by surrounding them at Kunar. And the faction of Hikmatyaar were but nurtured upon the books of Qutb and Mawdudi.

Then there comes this lying, sinful forelock of Morgan and claims that the "Neos" were responsible for all the violence around the world(!).

Due to the results of the doctrines and ideas being propounded by Safar and Salmaan and their effect upon the youth, Shaikh Ubaylaan – after he refuted and exposed these theoreticians and figureheads - was brutally beaten and came to near death in Haa'il. Shaikh Muhammad Amaan al-Jaamee was beaten up in al-Jawharah Masjid, and he is an old man. Shaikh Salih as-Suhaymee and Shaikh Abdur-Razzaaq al-'Abbaad were beaten in Qaseem and then again in al-Mudhannab, this time with bars. Arson attacks were made against Tasjeelaat Sabeel ul-Mu'mineen in Dhammaam, and Tasjeelaat ul-Manaar, with the intent of burning them to the ground. We do not say that the figureheads and theoreticians instigated this type of violence, but it certainly resulted from their doctrine and ideology that they were preaching to the youth of Saudi Arabia. Then the various bombings that took place in Ulayyaa, and Khobar, again committed by Qutubite elements who were driven by emotion and sentiment and not any Sharee'ah based-knowledge.

Then there comes this lying, sinful forelock of Morgan and claims that the "Neos" were responsible for all the violence around the world(!).

And then some of the Salafi brothers in Malmo, Sweden were attacked and severely wounded on account of violence incited by the Revolutionary Takfiris – after they failed to win them over to their repugnant doctrines. And the one called Abu Ubaydah Arkaan al-



Bayaati was the one who initiated the whole affair after he imported both revolutionary and takfeeri doctrines from al-Muntadaa al-Islaami, London, UK<sup>25</sup>.

---

<sup>25</sup> **THE FITNAH OF TAKFIR AND HAAKIMIYAH IN MAALMO, SWEDEN**

Abdul-Haqq Turkmani and Abu an-Noor al-Kurdi, the two brothers who were subject to violence from the direction of the Qutubites, stated, in their letter to the Senior Mashaayikh, informing them of what had happened:

In the Name of Allaah, the Most Merciful, Ever-Merciful to His Servants. All praise is due to Allaah, the Lord of the Worlds and prayers and peace upon the Seal of the Prophets and Messengers, and upon his family and his companions. The [beginnings of this] story of fitnah goes back some months, when a person called Abu Ubaydah Arkaan al-Bayaati began to spread some very dangerous ideas which were based upon two essential matters:

- a) revilement upon the Scholars, abusing them, and making accusations against them, describing them as “workers (for the government)”, and “slaves of the authorities”, and at the forefront of these such scholars (being accused) was the esteemed Father, Shaikh ul-Islaam, Abdul-Azeez Ibn Baaz (hafidhahullaah ta'aalaa).
- b) takfir of the Rulers and inciting the common-folk against them, without any sound principle and without recourse to the Scholars.

And these dangerous and twisted ideas were imported by the aforementioned from Britain, since his brother works in al-Muntadaa al-Islaamee in London and he openly pronounces that he is from the Jamaa'ah of Muhammad Suroor and that he ascribes to it.

He also tried to bring to into the aid of his da'wah some of the ignorant and gullible youth. More specifically, Abu Marwaan al-Kurdee, who is affected by Jinn, and the brothers had treated him on numerous occasions but without any benefit, since his is a distressing affair and is well-known to many people. Also Muhammad al-Kuwaiti and another person who had spent about a year in Britain and who had been infested with these dangerous ideas. He is called Abu 'Imaad Saamee who used to be known as Ismaa'eel whilst in Manchester.

All of the aforementioned are members of Jam'iyyah ath-Thiqaafiyyah al-Islaamiyyah in Maalmo. Some of them are in the administrative council and others in the consultative council....

.... And in this manner they sought to incite the common-folk against us until some of them stood in the midst of that gathering and said, “We will smash their heads and beat them”. And this is how they tried to bring about the realisation of what would assist their aims. However, will they be able to deliver themselves from the anger and punishment of Allaah!

We kept to both intellect and reason and we showed great zeal in trying to bring about rectification and truce and we maintained the best of suspicions about them - going to extreme limits in all of that, and to this end we requested a gathering in which we could explain our manjah (methodology) to them and our call to them....

.... And so we waited, anticipating the day we would see rectification and justice, having good thoughts about them. However, we were taken by surprise when they gathered the people in their mosque after the Maghrib prayer on the day of Jumu'ah on 23/8/1996 and when Abu Anfaal - the one who broke his covenant and his promise, may Allaah give him what he deserves - gave a lengthy lecture which can be summarised as follows:

- 1) That we are Jaamees (Jaamiyyoon) and we are the followers of Doctor Madhkhalee who is deviated in his aqeedah and manhaj and that we say that whoever is not upon his manhaj then he is not a Salafi. 2) That we take orders and planning and wealth from the Saudi Government. 3) That we say that every one who commits an act of kufr is a kaafir and that anyone who falls in to innovation is an Innovator. 4) That we

Then there comes this lying, sinful forelock of Morgan and claims that the “Neos” were responsible for all the violence around the world(!!).

And there is that wicked dog of a Kharijite, Abdullaah Faisal, who claims studentship under Nasir al-Umar and Abdul-Wahhaab at-Tareere, who makes takfir of all of those whom he calls “Saudi-Salafis” and he says that they are “the munaafiqeen of the very first times” and he says that their wives are living in fornication because their husbands who are Salafis are Kuffar, Murtaddoon. And he makes it permissible to kill them. And all of this in his cassette “The Devil’s Deception of the Saudi Salafis”. And all of what he spoke of in this cassette, then a fair part of it was taken from the works of Abdur-Razzaaq ash-Shayijee, the one who coined the phrase, “Salafiyyah Jadeedah (New Salafiyyah)”, and “Addi’aa as-Salafiyyah (Claimants to Salafiyyah or Neo-Salafis)”. And he mentioned in his wicked lecture, the works of ash-Shayijee. Likewise, this Kharijite considers that the only true scholars on the face of the earth are the likes of Safar and Salman(!!).

Then there comes this lying, sinful forelock of Morgan and claims that the “Neos” were responsible for all the violence around the world(!!). And in truth, the source of Morgan’s lies against the Salafis traces back to the likes of ash-Shayijee, since Morgan has but adopted the terminology of ash-Shayijee against the Salafis to whom he is an enemy... May Allaah sever him and silence him for the world is not in need of the evil or Morgan, and nor his wicked, shameful lies.

---

perform takfeer of all of the Islamic groups. 5) That we say that King Fahd is the Wali ul-Amr of the Kingdom. 6) That we say it is not permissible to revolt against the Rulers, and even if say we can, then it must be after making recourse to the Scholars. 7) That we reject the various terrorist activities that took place in the Kingdom.

As for the first four points then they are pure lies and false accusations. As for the final three, then we had explained these issues to them on numerous occasions, repeatedly and that in these issues we adhere to what the Ulamaa have said concerning them, and that we would not leave these sayings ever.

And we now present to you the broad aspects of the thought and da’wah of these people:

1). Making takfir of the Servant to the Two Noble Harams (King Fahd). The Mudeer of the Jam’iyyah said, “The Scholars have declared him a disbeliever”. 2) Reviling the Scholars, and describing them as “workers for the authorities” and some of them would say, “they are not able to speak due to fear of the Rulers” and they would also call them “the scholars of women’s menses and impurities”. 3) Reviling the Shaikh, Doctor Rabee’ al-Madkhalee, describing him as a spy and paid worker, and that he is at the head of those who burnt the books in Madinah - in their claim - and that he is deviated in aqeedah and manhaj. 4) Supporting the revolt against the Rulers. 5) Supporting terrorist activities and partisan activities across the world, especially in the Kingdom and rejoicing greatly with all of that, and making propaganda for all of that and for those who partook in them. 6) Everyone who calls for recourse to the Scholars and to wisdom and to Sharee’ah knowledge - then he, in their estimation is a “Jaamee” and a worker for the Saudi State. 7) Supporting al-Mis’ari, spreading his magazine and his writings....” End of the words of Abdul-Haqq Turkmani and Abu an-Noor al-Kurdi.

And this, O Sunni, is the legacy of all the Revolutionary Takfiris the Qutubites, the sect of Safar and Salman and all those poisoned with their doctrines...

And then what there is of Qutubite and Revolutionary, Takfiri threats against the Salafis in all the various parts of the Earth, all because they are held to be “spies” and “agents” and “supporters of the thrones of the tyrants” and so on... all of this being a result of the da’wah of Safar and Salman and the wicked Qutubite doctrine and agenda being infused into the minds of the youth of the Ummah and refuge is from Allaah. And it was precisely this, namely these accusations against anyone who did not agree to the Qutubite, Kharijite doctrine, that eventually led to the justification of the beating, or killing, of those who did not agree to it or partake in its requirements – and refuge is from Allaah.

And after all of this, the wicked, sinful, lying, shameless forelock of Morgan allows the Angels by his side to write in his record, “...in the years of inter-salafi fitna instigated by the neos... all of the violence around the world came from their side.” And thus we give him the glad tidings, that we will dispute this with him in the presence of our Lord. O Morgan... you take your words lightly and we consider them to be heavy indeed... if you but knew...

### **Buckets of Fantasies. Qutubi and Revolutionary Fantasies That Is.**

Morgan continued:

Quite simply: there is no such thing as “Qutbism”. It is a spectre and the fantasy of certain people. It leads them to such idiotic position as to put Sh. Safar and Sh. Al-Awda in the same “bucket” with the likes of At-Takfeer wa Al-Hijra. May the perpetrators of this nonsense stand before Allah right next to those they have slandered on Qiyama. Oh Allah! Allow me to witness your justice on that day. – Salim Morgan

And this but illustrates the great depths of his ignorance, ignorance of the true realities, and his ignorance of the Salafi Manhaj. It is as if Morgan – by his reasoning – is saying that quite simply there was no such man named Sayyid Qutb who authored “Milestones” and “az-Zilaal” and other books propounding the theories of the Khawaarij, and who performed takfir of all contemporary Muslim societies, and of all rulers and nation states, and who called for destructive Jihaads against the Ummah.

It is as if Morgan pretends to be blind to the saying of al-Qaradawi, “And it was in this period that the books of the Shaheed<sup>26</sup>, Sayyid Qutb appeared, the books that **represented his final thoughts** (in ideology, before his death). Those which **justified the takfir of (whole) societies...** the breaking of all sentimental attachments to society, breaking off ties with others, and **the announcement of a destructive jihad against the whole of mankind. And showing contempt against the du’at who call for lenience and softness, accusing them of idiocy, and being defeatist.** [Saying all of this], in front of the western civilisation. He made this manifest, in the most clear manner in the tafsir, “Fee Zilaal il-Qur’aan”, in

---

<sup>26</sup> It is not permissible to state “Shaheed So and So” without adding to that, “Inshaa’allaah”, since this is in opposition to the Sunnah and is the way of the Murji’ah. Imaam Bukhari included a chapter in the ‘Book of Jihad’ in his Sahih entitled, “Chapter: It is not to be said, so and so is a Shahid”.

the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition and in 'Ma'alim fit-Tariq' (Milestones), and the bulk of it is taken from 'Zilal' and 'Al-Islam wa Mushkilat al-Hadaarah' and others..."<sup>27</sup>

And then perhaps he is also ignorant of the saying of Fareed Abdul-Khaliq, Murshid of the Ikhwaan: "We have pointed out in what has preceded that the spread of the ideology of takfir occurred amongst the youth of the Ikhwaan who were imprisoned in the late fifties and early sixties, **and that they were influenced by the ideology of the Shaheed Sayyid Qutb and his writings. They derived from these writings that the society had fallen into Jahiliyyah (of kufr), and that he had performed takfir of the rulers who had rejected the Hakimiyyah of Allaah by not ruling by what Allaah has revealed, and also takfir of those ruled over (i.e. civilians), when they became satisfied with this.**"<sup>28</sup>

And perhaps he is also ignorant of the emergence of Qutubiyyah in Algeria – all of which led to the disaster in the 1990s. "And if you are ignorant of the Qutubiyyah – and I do not think that is the case – then come with me that I may give you a small glimpse of them, and this is in reference to the Algerian Qutubis, and the people of Makkah are most familiar with its streets"<sup>29</sup>. This astray sect (the Qutubiyyah) appeared in the 80s having been influenced by the tafsir 'az-Zilal' which was in those days a revered and precious book– and it has never stopped being so – which competed with the likes of at-Tabari and Ibn Kathir. A specific and very open type of propaganda was made for this book and it was subsequently sold in all the bookshops and was featured in all the national exhibitions until any student who did not have it in his house was not worth anything..." Abu Abdul-Bari' Abdul-Hamid bin Ahmad al-'Arabi in his book "Baree us-Saham" in refutation of the Qutubi, 'Adnan Ar'oor.

And then perhaps Morgan will feign ignorance of the saying of one of the Qutubite figureheads, Salaah as-Saawee, who said, "As for the **Qutubiyyoon** (the Qutubis), then their **methodology (manhaj)** is based primarily upon **the issue of legislation (tashree')**, explaining its link with the foundation of the religion and explaining that the various flaws that have engulfed the legal structures in our contemporary societies **nullify the contract of Islaam and demolish the very basis of Tawheed**. It is also known that the books that represent this particular orientation and which outline its methodology **are the books of the teacher, Sayyid Qutb** – may Allaah have mercy upon him – in the field of da'wah and public speeches." (Madaa Shar'iyat il-Intimaa ilal Ahzaab wal-Jamaa'at al-Islaamiyyah p.171).

And after all of this, the forelock of Morgan claims that there is no such thing as "Qutubism". And the Madinan Mashaayikh were the first to detect "Qutubism" being preached by the likes of Safar and Salman, and the book "Qutubiyyah" was authored in this regard to uncover this scandal – the book which the Qutubiyyah themselves burned in

---

<sup>27</sup> Priorities of the Islamic Movement (p.110)

<sup>28</sup> In 'Ikhwan ul-Muslimoon Fee Mizanil-Haqq' (p.115)

<sup>29</sup> Meaning a resident of a place is most familiar with the true condition of its inhabitants.

Dhammaam, Saudi Arabia. And likewise, our Mashaayikh and Imaams confirmed the existence of a “Qutubi Manhaj”, such as Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen and Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan (refer to NDV010011 for details).

And it is as if Morgan’s forelock has reasoned that unless a person says “I am a Kharijee” that he cannot be adhering to the doctrine or ideology of the Khawaarij, either in part or in whole.

Stated Abu Muhammad al-Yamani (d. approx. 550H), “Know, may Allaah strengthen you, that they (the Khawaarij) split into twelve groups: The Azaariqah, the Ibaadiyyah, the Safariyyah, the Baheesiyyah, the ‘Ajaariyyah, the Fadliyyah, the Najdaat, the Ghawniyyah, the Madbakiyyah, the Akhnasiyyah, the Shamraakiyyah, the Bakaariyyah, the Ma’loomiyyah, the Yazeediyyah, the Bakriyyah, the Abdaliyyah, the Maghaalibiyyah and the Salatiyyah. **All of the sects from these sects are ascribed to their respective Shaikh and to its particular books...**” (Aqaa’id ath-Thalaath Was Sab’eena Firqah, p. 18).

Then, Abu Muhammad al-Yamani looks at the teachings of each one of these groups and the particular person they are named after (having taken him as their Shaikh and his works as their referent point).

So we say, that the Qutubiyyah are an offshoot of the Khawaarij, their Shaikh is Sayyid Qutb and there reference points are his works, such as those mentioned earlier. Qutb propounded the doctrine of the Khawaarij and encouraged takfir and khurooj. And as for the Qutubites themselves, then they are those who promote the books of Qutb and defend him and aggrandise him, such as Safar al-Hawali, and Salman al-Awdah and Muhammad Suroor and Muhammad Qutb and so on. And it is concerning the likes of these that Imaam al-Albaani said, “the Khawaarij of the Era”(!!) O Morgan, this is what you call “the fantasy of certain people”(!!). And they are but our Mashaayikh and Imaams(!!). Qutubism is Kharijism. It is Khaarijiyyah. Just like Ibaadism, and ‘Ajaarism, and Fadlism, and Bakaarism (i.e. the teachings of those mentioned above) are all Kharijism(!!).

And perhaps this ought to lift the madness of Morgan and his oblivious and perfidious denial of the true realities, and the depths of his ignorance of Islamic history and the emergence and splitting of the sects

Then Morgan states, “...It leads them to such idiotic position as to put Sh. Safar and Sh. Al-Awda in the same “bucket” with the likes of At-Takfeer wa Al-Hijra...”.

**How can we not put them in the same “bucket”, when Imaam al-Albaani has actually put them in the same “bucket” as the original Khawaarij, albeit from certain perspectives.** Pray tell, in Allaah’s name O Morgan, dare you elaborate upon the knowledge-based doctrines of at-Takfir wal-Hijrah? Dare you list for us their source works and reference points and their leaders and Imaams from the contemporaries? Dare you list the doctrines of the Khawaarij, such as takfir of the sinners, absence of obedience to the wali-ul-amr (the one in authority), openly proclaiming the faults, crimes and sins of the

rulers, encouraging khurooj, and demonstrations and confrontations with the authorities and so on. Then dare you come with us for a week, so we can analyse and research into the doctrine and the da'wah that was being called to by the likes of Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah?

The "bucket" of at-Takfir wal-Hijrah is but Sayyid Qutb, his doctrine and his works, and the "bucket" of Safar and Salman is but Sayyid Qutb, his doctrine and his works. They drink from the same bucket, so it should be hardly surprising that the same pattern of events should emerge from them. Save that Ahl us-Sunnah in Sudan do not have the abundance of Salafi Mashaayikh and the authority to restrain what happened therein recently, as opposed to Saudi Arabia. For we saw the same pattern of events in Saudi Arabia, physical attacks against the Salafis and their Mashaayikh, and Allaah knows best, had there not been the kind of preventative authority, then perhaps what is worse could have occurred – and Algeria bears witness to the truthfulness of this concern of ours(!).

Then we say to Morgan that the likes of Safar and Salman and their followers from the rowdy-hooligans in the various parts of the Earth put Imaam al-Albaani in the same "bucket" as the likes of al-Bootee, the Innovator and Jahm Ibn Safwaan. They entered Imaam al-Albaani into the "bucket" of the Extremist Murji'ah and the Jahmiyyah – all in falsehood, not in truth - in mere idle falsehood, based upon lies and fanciful hallucinations. So we say, "May the perpetrators of this nonsense stand before Allah right next to those they have slandered on Qiyama. Oh Allah! Allow [us] to witness your justice on that day...". Ameen. Ameen. For our Mashaayikh proved and illustrated that the "bucket" of the various factions of the Khawaarij today is the one and same – with proofs and evidences and in truth, but as for the Activists, then they accused our Mashaayikh and Imaams in mere falsehood.

### **The Scandal Reaches Its Peak**

Morgan then came out of the closet, and revealed all:

There is no more benefit in talking to a fanatic or a wall. Go to your governments and your awliyaa al-umoor. They are, after all, the "companions of highness" and they have many other great attributes. And besides, we THINK that they pray, so even if they get on the payroll of the CIA and work hand in hand with Iblis himself against Islam and Muslims, we must not oppose them because of this prayer. We should make tabsheer to all enemies of Islam with this - we are the easiest ummah on this earth to defeat, just make sure your agents prostrate five times a day because the believers are not allowed to consider anything else. They have scholars who will give them these titles and refuse any discussion of their crimes against Islam and Muslims calling it the path of "khurooj", so you can have "legitimacy", as well as the favor of the rich and powerful. Probably the scholars do it to maintain the rujhaan of masaalih over mafaasid in the corrupt situation in which they live jazaahum 'annaa kulla khairin, but you can take it out of context and call it shari'a to honor those whom Allah despised and oppose all those who oppose them for Allah. They are more worthy of your love and your company and you of theirs.

All of this, in reality, is the saying of ash-Shayjee and others from the straying, wandering partians – which really translates as "Murji'ah with the Rulers, Khawaarij with the Du'aat

and Qadariyyah with the [plots and plans] of the Infidels". This is the exact meaning of what Morgan has spewed above. As we said earlier, the source and spring of all of the Ahl ul-Ahwaa is the one and same.

This is the same mental outburst that was made by the likes of Abdullaah Faisal al-Khaarijee, the Khaarijee of the UK. Here are some of his words...

The Khariji of the UK, Abdullaah Faisal states, **"...The reason why these hypocrites tell you to "forget about the shariah and concentrate on yourself" is because the Kaafir Paymasters of the Wicked Scholars have dismantled the shariah."** (Cassette: Devils Deception of the Murji'ah).

He also states, "These apostate leaders, these wicked scholars, and these students who blindly follow them are the enemies of Allah, the Rasool (saws) and al-Islam. When you are a sincere believer and truly love Allah, you could never take the enemies of Allah as friends. You would hate even the shadow of such a person who would cement the throne of the apostate leaders. **The next question that arises is, will Allah let the layman off on Judgement Day, who is blind following a sheikh or scholar, claiming that he is ignorant? The answer is NO and is supported by strong evidence from the Quran....** These ayats clearly refute those who claim that **the followers are ignorant and those who make excuses for them due to ignorance...** The Murji never will cease in his attempts to circumvent Allah's law and decree. The Murji is always looking for a loophole by which he may escape his duty and responsibility to Allah, and by which he may mislead others to do the same. **In doing so, the Murji claims that you can practice what is called "al -uthru bil jahl" which means to make an excuse for the sinner because he is ignorant..."** (Cassette: Devils Deception of the Murji'ah).

Stated Abdullaah Faisal, the Khariji of the UK, **"...and those who propagate and defend the false aqeedah of "Kufr dun al Kufr" have gone against the ijma of the ummah in this regard..."** also **"They travel all over the world and get paid handsomely from the Apostate Saudi Regime to propagate the aqeedah that lends credence to "Kufr dun al Kufr"..."** (Cassette: Devils Deception of the Murji'ah).

Now compare carefully between the sayings of Morgan and Abdullaah Faisal quoted above, and reflect and contemplate – and do not forget that Morgan has affectations to the da'wah of Safar and Salman, and that Abdullaah Faisal's source of vilification of the Salafis is ash-Shayijee, whose teachings, Morgan is parroting. Morgan also made insinuations that we played the role of spies, and although we were not paid, we were merely volunteers to this service...

It is so comforting and such a source of pride to know that we have our very own mukhaabaraat who are busy "researching" dangerous individuals such as myself in order to warn the Muslims. And volunteers such as yourself to supplement the paid ones at that! ...- Salim Morgan

Lest Morgan accuse us of equating him with the likes of Abdullaah Faisal al-Khaarijee al-Khabeeth, we make it clear that we have only stated that there are great similarities in the tone, nature and detail of their statements, and that in their attacks against the Salafis they have the same source, or reference point. There may be different extremes in them, but there are great similarities between them. But we do not equate between them, like for like.

### **Between the Salafi and Qutubi Manhaj**

In truth, Morgan is confused and totally ignorant of the Salafi Manhaj or at least he pretends to be ignorant. He feigns ignorance of the saying of Allaah, Most High:

**Allaah has promised to those amongst you who truly have Imaan (true faith and belief) and act in obedience to Allaah and His Messenger, that He will grant them rulership upon the earth, just as He granted it to those before them, and that He will establish their Religion for them and grant them the authority to practice their Religion which He chose and ordered them with. And He will certainly change their situation to one of security, after their fear. Providing that they worship and obey Me, not associating anything else in worship with Me. Then, whoever rejects this favour by disobedience to their Lord - then they are the rebellious transgressors. (Soorah an-Noor 24:55)**

And also:

**And Allâh puts forward the example of a township that dwelt secure and well content; its provision coming to it in abundance from every place, but it (its people) denied the Favours of Allâh (with ungratefulness). So Allâh made it taste the extreme of hunger (famine) and fear, because of that which they (its people) used to do. (An-Nahl 16:112)**

And also:

**That is so because Allâh will never change a grace which He has bestowed on a people until they hange what is in their ownelves. And verily, Allâh is All-Hearer, All-Knower. (Al-Anfal 8:53)**

And when one returns to the tafseer of the likes of these verses and to the sayings of the Erudite Imaams concerning them, then one learns that it is Allaah who either grants security or removes it from the people, either by way of their committing Shirk or innovation or their becoming ungrateful for the favours of Allaah. So what we see today in all of the Muslim countries today of the absence of total Sharee'ah rule, in varying degrees, is a result of what the hands of men have earned – not as a result of what the Infidels have plotted and planned, for their plots and plans are under the control and plot of Allaah who plots whatever He wills, and He often empowers the Infidels and Tyrannical Rulers over the Muslims – as a punishment from Him, so that His servants may heed and return. And this is how our Salaf viewed al-Hajjaaj, as a punishment and trial from Allaah. And this can also be said about the Tribulations of the Tartars and Genghis Khan.



So the difference between the Salafi Manhaj and the Qutubi Manhaj is that the Salafis return to the true causes of the humiliation and defeat and do not merely focus on the symptom – making great commotion and fuss about it, and bewildering the common-folk, increasing their hatred of those in authority, wasting their time in sentimentalism, the venting of anger – as Morgan's words would lead to – and so on. This produces no benefit – as Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen explained in his words quoted at the very beginning of this discourse and which appear below.

And this in no way means that the Salafis justify and condone anything that proceeds from the Rulers – rather they are the ones who detest it the most. Why? Because they are the ones who treat its true and real underlying causes!! Now reflect carefully upon the following two aforementioned statements of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen once again:

Stated Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen, “These words are very good (i.e. Imaam al-Albaanee's). Meaning, that those people pass judgement against the Rulers of the Muslims, that they are disbelievers, what benefit do they achieve by judging them to be disbelievers? Are they able to put an end to them? They are not able. And when it is the case that the Jews have occupied Palestine for around 50 years, yet despite that the Islamic Ummah has not been able in its entirety – Arabs and Non-Arabs alike – to remove them from their place! How then, after this, can we go and strike those who rule over us with our tongues (i.e. make takfir of them) while we know that we are not capable of putting an end to them, and that blood will be shed, and the taking of wealth will become lawful, and even the honours of people. And then we will not even have achieved the desired result!! **Therefore, what is the benefit – such that if a person was to believe – in that which is between him and his Lord – that amongst the rulers is one who is a disbeliever in truth, with the kufr that ejects from the religion - what then is the benefit in announcing this and spreading this, except the kindling of tribulation?!**” (Fitnah of Takfir, p.74)

And also the Shaikh's answer to the question of Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Misri that was quoted right at the beginning of this discourse, concerning the slanders against Ahl us-Sunnah that they are Murij'ah, Khawaarij, Qadariyyah and Raafidah, “I hate that this [slander] should occur from one set of brothers to another. And I consider this to be slander, and making insults by name-calling. Those ones (who are accused) do not like to speak against the rulers on top of the pulpits, since that does not bring about any rectification, as is evident. However, this does not mean that they justify everything that occurs from the Rulers. They actually consider that some of what occurs from the Rulers is an error and some of it is correct. However, this does not mean that we now stand on top of the minbar and in the midst of the societies and the lectures, or in specific (private) gatherings – since in all of this there is not benefit. The intent of the one who wishes to give advice is to bring about real correction in the leaders, not just releasing one's anger, seeking vengeance. So whoever intended rectification of the leaders, then it is necessary for him to tread upon the path in which there is true rectification. As for the one who merely wishes to vent his anger and to quench one's thirst and to treat one's disease – then the affair of such of one to Allaah the Mighty and Majestic, and we are not in need at this moment to give examples of those who wish to rectify the Rulers, yet they stand on top of

the pulpits and revile and abuse them, in front of all of those in the gatherings and lectures. We do not wish to mention any examples of this because the reality bears witness (to what occurs from the likes of these). (Cassette: "As'ilat Abil-Hasan al-Misri al-Ma'rabi lish-Shaikhain Ibn Baz wa Ibn Uthaimen").

And then also reflect upon the advice of the three Imaams of our times to the Algerians:

Imaam al-Albaanee stated in the message he sent to the leaders (of the various parties) in Algeria, "...And that the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), indeed, he began setting up the Muslim state by calling to Tawheed and warning from worshipping the false gods and then cultivating whoever responded to his calls upon the Sharee'ah rulings until they all became like a single body, such that if one part of it complained, the rest of it responds with alertness, as occurs in the authentic hadeeth... so whoever wishes to establish a Muslim state in truth then let him not gather the masses into a lump, and nor bring them together despite the differences in their thoughts and their (ideological) nurturing, as is the way of well-known Islamic groups today. Rather, it is a must to unite their way of thinking and understanding upon the correct Islamic foundations: the Book and the Sunnah upon the understanding of the Salaf us-Saalih..."<sup>30</sup>

Imaam Ibn Baaz, said, responding to the claim that the activists of Algeria had alleged he supported them and advised them to take up arms, "If one of the Algerian du'at (callers) had said about me that I had said to them, "They should assassinate the police or that they should take up arms in their call to Allaah then this is an error and is not correct. Rather it is a lie. The Call to Allaah occurs with good mannerisms, "Allaah said, the Messenger said". It occurs with reminders, admonition, encouragement and discouragement. **This is how the Call to Allaah takes place, just as the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and his companions were in the Makkah al-Makarramah before they had any power or authority. They did not used to call the people to take up arms, rather they called them with the verses of the Qur'aan, good words, and good mannerisms, since all of that is closer to rectification and is closer to the acceptance of the truth. As for calling with assassinations, killing, fighting and the likes, then that is not from the Sunnah of the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and nor is it from the Sunnah of his Companions.** However, when Allaah gave him control over Madinah and when he emigrated to it, he had authority and power in Madinah and then Jihaad was legislated as well as the establishment of the Hudood laws. He (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) made Jihaad against the Mushrikeen and established the Hudood after Allaah ordered him with this." (Cassette Recording on 26<sup>th</sup> Dhul-Hijjah, 1414H, being an exposition of the forgery of Salman al-Awdah against Imaam Ibn Baaz – refer to Madaarik un-Nadhar (pp. 346-348 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition).)

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen was asked, "Did you also advise (the Algerians) to continue in their position against the authorities in Algeria? The Shaikh replied, "We have never said anything of the sort." The questioner said, "In the severity of these situations is hijrah

---

<sup>30</sup> As occurs in his letter dated, 19 Jumaadah al-Aakhirah 1412H and the a photocopy of this letter can be found in Madarik un-Nadhar pp.335-336 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.

(emigration) to the lands of disbelief legislated?" The Shaikh replied, "It is obligatory to have patience. Since the land is a land of Islaam, the call to prayer is announced for the five prayers and both the Jumu'ah and congregational prayers (i.e. Eid, funeral and daily prayers) are established therein. Hence, it is obligatory to have patience until the command of Allaah arrives."<sup>31</sup> (Cassette recording Shawwaal, 1414H, quoted in Madaarik un-Nadhar, and also in Baraa'ah Ulamaa il-Ummah Min Tazkiyaat Ahl il-Bid'ah, checked by Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen himself).

Morgan stated thereafter:

True, to fight them before its time or without preparation is foolishness and is also fisaad fiy al-ardh. To acquiesce, accept and even defend and praise this transgression against Islam and Muslims is corruption beyond belief.

The point that Morgan has failed to realise is that the kind of ideology he is upon and also what was being promoted by the likes of Safar and Salman after their being poisoned from the direction of some of the key Qutubite, Kharijite figureheads, actually leads to fighting the rulers before the time. The forelock of Morgan is not capable of understanding these kinds of issues, as it has already amply illustrated, because most of the time, in fact in the overwhelming majority of the time, people like Morgan are just filled with sentimentalism and zeal. In Algeria, there was the perfect example. Likewise, in Syria and Egypt. True, the activists intended good, but never for one day did they bring about good. Because they try to achieve first, what the Messenger left at the very end. But their ideology of Qutubism, blinded them from seeing that. This is why Ayyoob as-Sakhtiyaanee said that all of innovation leads to the use of the sword. And so the doctrine of Qutubism led to them to the use of the sword and khurooj. This is the inherent nature and characteristic of the Qutubite doctrine. One may not condone violence or cold-blooded murder, but the doctrine will certainly lead to it over time.

As for the second of Morgan's sentences above, "To acquiesce, accept and even defend and praise this transgression against Islam and Muslims is corruption beyond belief", then Allaah knows best what he intends by it and Allaah knows best what made him mention it, and Allaah knows best why he had to add "...and even defend and praise this transgression..."(!), Allaah knows best what his game is and who he is referring to? For there is no one who truly believes in Allaah who acquiesces or defends this transgression. But because Morgan has become confused by the da'wah of the Biased Partisans, his vision has been clouded and he only sees through faulty perceptions, and hence anyone who does not vent his anger, cause commotion, scream, shout and wail about those in authority and their actions, then he must be acquiescing to everything that proceeds from them. And this falsehood has already been dealt with in the words of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen quoted at the beginning of this treatise so refer to it.

---

<sup>31</sup> Compare with the statements of al-Hasan al-Basri quoted in "Elementary Qutubism" (Important Principles).

But then there is another matter that illustrates Morgan's weak knowledge and understanding. From another perspective, what occurs from the Rulers and those in authority in oppression of the Muslims, is either a test for them or a punishment for them. It all comes from Allaah. To accept this is a must, and is denied only by a Qadari ingrate. This acknowledgement does not mean that the oppression must be "defended and praised" as the Mental World of Morgan would reason. Rather, it must be repelled, not by neo-Qutubite Bolshevik Rehearsals and other such matters, but by the dictates of the Book, the Sunnah and Salafiyyah. And this is discussed further below in the section titled "Rectification of the Affairs" in which the sayings of the Salaf are presented in this regard, amongst them Ibn Abil-Izz al-Hanafi.

### Hidden and Implicit Takfir

It is known that none of the Ulamaa have made takfir of the Rulers of the Gulf States, those like Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the Emirates<sup>32</sup>. When it is the case that they have not

---

#### <sup>32</sup> EXCERPT FROM THE CASSETTE "QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON AL-HAAKIMIYYAH"

**Questioner:** "Someone has understood from your words in Kitaab ut-Tawheed, which are from your comments, with regards to the issue of al-Haakimiyyah and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. So they have understood from them that (by the act alone) you perform specific takfir of a specific ruler who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed. And then they applied (what they understood from your words) to the rulers of the Gulf states.

**Shaikh al-Fawzan:** [Laughs]... is it due to hawaa (desire)?.. the words are clear, there is no ambiguity in them, the words are clear. The distinction (tafsil) that is mentioned (i.e. previously in the chapter) relates to them<sup>32</sup>. And it was then said after that that the one who banishes the Shari'ah entirely and puts another law in its place, that this is evidence to show that he views the [secular] law to be better than the Sharee'ah, **and whoever holds this opinion, he is the one who is a kaafir [emphasis given]**. This is in the same book itself... however they only take [from the book] according to their own understanding of it and what is of benefit to them, yet they abandon the rest of the words. If they had read the words from the beginning, the matter would have become clear [to them].

**Questioner:** And the statement of Shaikh Muhammad Ibn Ibraheem is [understood] in the same way?

**Shaikh al-Fawzan:** **Yes, it is the same.** His words mean that the one who abolishes the Shari'ah and puts in its place another law, **then this gives evidence that he considers this law to be better than the Sharee'ah. And [subsequently] whoever considers this law to be better than the Sharee'ah, then such a one is a kaafir in the view of everybody, there is no doubt in this.**

**Questioner:** They mean the rulers of the Gulf states O Shaikh? **Shaikh al-Fawzan:** [words unclear] ... the words [in the book] are general. As for people and specific individuals, then this requires investigation.

**Questioner:** So there is a difference between [takfir of] a specific individual and a general ruling? **Shaikh al-Fawzan:** Yes, between a general ruling...

**Questioner:** So you intended only a general ruling [not a ruling upon specific individuals]? **Shaikh al-Fawzan:** Yes, a general ruling, there is no doubt about this. So he said 'the rulers of the Gulf states (was meant)?'

**Questioner:** Yes, this is it, however al-hawaa (desire) overtook him? **Shaikh al-Fawzan:** Yes, hawaa (desire).. [words unclear]... Is this rectification? Performing takfir of the rulers of the Gulf states, is this from rectification (of the affairs)?

**Questioner:** No it is not... **Shaikh al-Fawzan:** It is not rectification... it is but kindling of tribulation (fitnah).

**Questioner:** May Allaah reward you..." End of the discussion.

been expelled from Islaam, then no matter how sinful they are, Islaam is still established for them – since we cannot remove this with a doubt. Morgan insinuates otherwise and likes to base his views on mere suspicion and conjecture:

And besides, we THINK that they pray, so even if they get on the payroll of the CIA and work hand in hand with Iblis himself against Islam and Muslims, we must not oppose them because of this prayer

As for Ahl us-Sunnah then the principles of takfir are well known to them, from the likes of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, Shaikh ul-Islaam Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab and others – and the Salafis uphold these principles.

Then when it is the case that we do not know these Rulers as individuals to be apostates with certainty, then all of what is reported in the Sunnah concerning the behaviour with the Rulers, is to be maintained, regardless of how evil, tyrannical and sinful they become. And this includes not publicising their faults in public, advising them in secret, giving them obedience in all of that which is good, not rebelling against them, even if they reject and do not act upon the advice and admonition against them and so on. When the Salafi Mashaayikh authored works in this regard, so that the Sunnah would be adopted, they were labelled spies and paid workers, a mighty and slanderous fabrication indeed.

But we did not see any adherence to the Sunnah from the Qutubites, such as Safar and Salman and their followers from the biased partisans. Rather, we saw Salman using the open criticism of Dhul-Khuwaisarah at-Tamimi against the Messenger (salallaahu alaihi wasallam) as his justification for open criticism of the Rulers (!!), we saw both Safar and Salman promoting and spreading the secret faxes of Muhammad al-Mis'ari (which publicised some of the shortcomings and sins of those in authority) taking them and reading them out in the sermons, on the pulpits and in the lectures. So either they were hiding or concealing takfir, or they were wilfully opposing the Sunnah and the guidance of Allaah's Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam).

And this is what we hold of all the Qutubites, Suroorists and Biased Partisans in the various parts of the world. Either they are hiding and concealing what is with them of takfir. And if they are not upon this takfir, then why do they show such intense hatred, make wicked slanders and lies, and viciously attack the Salafis, who merely call for what the Sunnah calls for in these types of situations?! Indeed in this there is a mighty admonition and a great lesson. We ask why did the likes of Ali Timimi, Idris Palmer, many other Qutubites, and more recently Morgan, why did they all mock us and slander us with these titles, "Murji'ah with the Rulers" and insinuate that we were spies and aspired for the wealth of "the companions of highness" and the rest of their wicked slanders. Why? When we but called for what the Sunnah called for?! It is because they are poisoned with the Ahwaa (the desires), and this is all but evident from them, from their behaviour, their writings, their mockery and sarcasm. The Qutubites had an agenda, but the Sunnah got in their way, and so to oppose it they began to call those who called to it "spies" and "agents"

and so on, and they suspected their intentions and passed judgements upon them in falsehood.

### **Mockery and Belittlement of the Scholars**

In fact their mockery and sarcasm could not even leave the scholars alone. Pay careful attention to the following words of Morgan:

They have scholars who will give them these titles and refuse any discussion of their crimes against Islam and Muslims calling it the path of "khurooj", so you can have "legitimacy", as well as the favor of the rich and powerful. Probably the scholars do it to maintain the rujhaan of masaalih over mafaasid in the corrupt situation in which they live jazaahum 'annaa kulla khairin, but you can take it out of context and call it shari'a to honor those whom Allah despised and oppose all those who oppose them for Allah. They are more worthy of your love and your company and you of theirs.

He is referring here to the Ulamaa. In reality what he has stated above is exactly the same as what the likes of Suroor, Muhammad Qutb, Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq, Safar and Salman were labelling our scholars, "scholar dollars", "forced to make flattery", "scholars of the desert". As Salman said, **"Indeed, the positions of religious authority have become a monopoly in the hands of the well-known bands [of individuals], amongst those who excelled in the art of compromise and deception. And, in the view of the authorities, they have become the chief spokesmen in the name of Islam and the Muslims despite the fact that they have no role to play except in two matters, 1) Announcing the commencement and end of Ramadan and 2) Attacking those whom they call extremists.."** and the teacher of Salman, Muhammad Suroor said, **"My amazement never ceases about those who talk about Tawheed while they are the slaves of the slaves of the slaves of the slaves of the slaves, and their final master is a Christian (i.e. the President of the US)."** (Refer to Intermediate Qutubism, GRV070004).

Morgan states, "They have scholars who will give them these titles and refuse any discussion of their crimes against Islaam and the Muslims calling it the path of khurooj..." to the end of the sentence. He is referring here to Imaam Ibn Baaz, Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen, Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and others from Ahl us-Sunnah. And if he denies that he is referring to them, then his words are in actually fact referring to them in truth, whether he realises it or not, or whether he intended it or not.

From Shaikh Abu Uthmaan Mohammad al-Anjaree of Kuwait who stated that he went directly to Imaam Ibn Baaz and asked him questions related to replacement of the Sharee'ah in Kuwait. He informed the Shaikh about the true realities happening in Kuwait and what was taking place of not ruling by the Sharee'ah in full graphical detail. Then he asked him, are the leaders Kuffaar or "Wullaat ul-Umoor" and should we obey them? And the Shaikh replied in they are Wullaat ul-Umoor and they have the rights of obedience in that which is good. Shaikh al-Anjaree made 20,000 copies of the cassette and distributed it in Kuwait, much to the dislike of the Qutubists. This information can be readily verified from the Shaikh and the cassette is well known anyhow. It is also known that in answer to numerous questions about the Rulers of the Gulf States, Imaam Ibn Baaz said that they are

“Wullaat al-Umoor” and should be given their rights in that which is good – and this is on cassette, recorded and preserved and with us.

Morgan's sickness really comes to the fore when he attempts to hide his clear attack and mockery of the Ulamaa by saying, “Probably the scholars do it to maintain the rujhaan of masaalih over mafaasid in the corrupt situation in which they live jazaahum 'annaa kulla khairin”, and he says “Probably...”. This was the type of poison being spread by the likes of Safar and Salman – as a result of which the circles and gatherings of the likes of Imaam Ibn Baaz were all but empty because the youth preferred the emotionalism and sentimentalism in the political speech and analysis of these activists. This is a reality witness in Saudi Arabia. The youth left the books of Sunnah and the Scholars of the Sunnah and instead took the the books of Bid'ah, the books of Sayyid Qutb and Suroor and so on – after the likes of Salman portrayed Sayyid Qutb as an Imaam of Guidance to the youth. And they belittled and mocked our scholars by claiming they do not know what is going on around them, and that they are ignorant of the true realities.

### **The Ancient Claim**

Morgan is merely parroting what they were preaching and what they were preaching is not too dissimilar to those who came to Abu Mijliz, and this is the way of all the Revolutionary Takfiris.<sup>33</sup>

---

#### <sup>33</sup> **THE KHARJITE ARGUMENT AGAINST AHL US-SUNNAH**

“And what has come from Ibn ‘Abbaas has also come from others besides him, from the Salaf of this Ummah and from its scholars. To give examples, what has been reported by at-Tabari in his tafsir, that a group of the Ibadi'ah sat with Abu Mijliz and they said to him, Allah says, “whoever does not judge by what Allah has revealed, they are the disbelievers, they are the oppressors, they are the rebellious” Abu Mijliz replied, “Certainly they do what they do and they know that it is a sin. And this verse was revealed concerning the Jews and the Christians.” They replied, By Allah you do not know what we know but you only fear them.” He replied, You have more reason to do that than we do, as for us we do not know what you know but you know it.”

The chain of narration is authentic also and its meaning that those Ibadis, who were one of the groups of the Khawarij, came to Abu Mijlaz and sought to use this verse to do to takfir of the rulers of that time and he replied to them with a reply of the People of Knowledge, the reply of Ahl us-Sunnah, he said, “those rulers whom you do takfir of on account of his verse do what they do of sins and evils such as oppression, tyranny etc. they do these things and they know that they are sinful. So they do not make lawful their actions which they have fallen into from amongst those things that are in opposition to the rule of Allah, the Sublime the Most High.

So their affair is just like the affair of all the other Muslims, those who commit sins but without declaring them to be lawful for themselves.

So those Ibadis said to him, “you know that what we say is the truth, but you fear them,” meaning wish to compromise with them and their actions etc.

And this is one of the mechanisms of the People of Desires that comes at the end of the narration, and this is that when the people of knowledge argue against them and refute their falsehood, they resort to the likes of these machinations, so they said to this scholar, you compromise, that you fear them etc. They said this when

And then he continues in his wicked slanders by saying that although the Scholars are in constrained situations and have to sit there and witness this evil but remain silent about it, their followers (meaning the Salafis) take all of this out of context and claim that it is from the Shari'ah to honour the sinful rulers. We are well aware of this type of polemic and nonsense. This is how the biased partisans argue with us. They do not argue on the basis of Sharee'ah knowledge, it is all lies, emotions and sentiments. They try to make the people flee from knowledge and its people and from the Sunnah and its people. In the whole duration of the discussion with Morgan, in which his scandal was perpetrated, not once did he venture into discussing the Sharee'ah rulings on these issues, and not once did he comment on the many scores of narrations (from the Salaf of the past and from the likes of Imaam al-Albani, Imaam Ibn Baaz, and Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen) presented to him related to these issues and current tribulations.

He avoided all of that and all he presented was sarcasm, insinuation, generalised statements and belittlement and mockery. This is the way of Ahl ul-Ahwaa.

As for the sinful Rulers, then in our hearts we hate what is with them of disobedience, sinfulness and absence of fulfilling the commands of Allaah. And neither do we love them for this, nor do we condone any of their behaviour. Rather, we hate all of that for Allaah's sake. But as for our objection to the neo-Qutubites and Kharijites and those affected by their da'wah and call and their sentimentalism and innovated methodologies, then we do not oppose them because they (the Biased Partisans) hate all of that (i.e. what they see of evil) for the sake of Allaah – for we hate that too – but we oppose the Partisans and rebuke them because they have opposed the command of Allaah and His Messenger in their da'wah and their behaviour and their methodologies (manaahij), in their ideas and beliefs and their way of adopting methods and avenues that the Sunnah does not sanction – such as what occurred from the likes of Safar and Salman and Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq. This is what we hate and object to and what we despise. This is the difference O Morgan, perhaps you might take a moment to reflect, and take back your wicked slanders and kerb your fanciful hallucinations and reproach that sinful forelock.

### **The Scandal Matures...**

Morgan continued:

I declare my innocence of the khawaarij and their principles and Allah knows I have no need to declare this. I declare that there is no shaari' but Allah and anyone who fights to establish the rule of kufr over the

---

he replied to them whilst depending upon the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam).

However, the one who is firmly grounded in his knowledge is never shaken by these kind of ploys, but it only makes him firm upon what is evident to him that it is the truth from the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and he does not pay attention to the mischief of the troublemakers and those who cause agitation and sedition in the land." (Shaikh Abdus-Salaam Burjis in his lecture "Ruling by Other than What Allaah Has Revealed")



Muslims and their lands is fighting with Allah. To those who say there is no tauhid al-haakimiya, I say there is likewise no tauhid al-asmaa wa as-sifaat. Neither are from the sunnah by name or details and both are structures invented by our scholars as needs dictated to aid us in understanding the underlying truths. Since the days of Kamal Attaturk, the need for understanding tauhid al-haakimiya is clear to those of sound understanding. Anyone who "canonizes" three and rejects any others in spite of the validity of the underlying proofs has spoken without any authority from Allah - kaa'in man kaan. It is mere sophistry to debate whether this is kufr, kufr duna kufr or just fisaad fiy al-ardh. On the practical level, it makes no difference. All can be fought physically and in all other ways by the believers if they persist in their 'udwaan against Allah and His deen. Abu Hanifah, Ibn Katheer and Ibn Taimia all agree on the legitimacy of fighting those who destroy Allah's deen on this earth and institute its opposite, partially or totally. They are surely of the salaf before you. This is Allah's deen with which I hope to face Him on Qiyama. True, to fight them before its time or without preparation is foolishness and is also fisaad fiy al-ardh. To acquiesce, accept and even defend and praise this transgression against Islam and Muslims is corruption beyond belief. - Salim Morgan

Not only do you need to declare your innocence from the Khawaarij and their principles, you also need to declare your innocence from those who preach its doctrine and from those for whom you have displayed blind hizbiyyah, in other than the truth. You also need to declare your innocence from this undue emotionalism and sentimentalism that does no one any good, but only leads to frustration and anger, and then wicked accusations and slanders against the innocent ones. You need to free yourself and restrain yourself from outbursts such as those above, which but pave the way for the ideology of the Khawaarij.

I declare that there is no shaari' but Allah and anyone who fights to establish the rule of kufr over the Muslims and their lands is fighting with Allah

Yes, so do we. But this is not our starting point. It is the starting point of the Khawaarij. Go and correct your manhaj.

To those who say there is no tauhid al-haakimiya, I say there is likewise no tauhid al-asmaa wa as-sifaat. Neither are from the sunnah by name or details and both are structures invented by our scholars as needs dictated to aid us in understanding the underlying truths.

Morgan, like most of the activists totally missed the point in the clarifications provided by the People of Knowledge on the issues of al-Haakimiyyah and the usage of "Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah" as an independent category.

### **An Important Point About al-Haakimiyyah and Tawheed**

Firstly, there are two types of Tawheed. That which is related to knowledge and that which is related to action. This is what Ibn al-Qayyim calls "Tawheed ul-Ilm wal-Ma'rifah" and "Tawheed ul-Qasd wal-Iraadah" respectively. All of Tawheed and its various types, shades, meanings etc. come under these two. Others from the Salaf split the Tawheed related to knowledge into two categories, Tawheed ur-Ruboobiyyah and Tawheed ul-Asmaa was-Sifaat. **All of Tawheed does not exit from what has been mentioned above of the terms and structures used to describe and qualify it.** As for this claim that the Scholars invented terms and structures as and when needed, then this is a fallacy. *For the scholars defined the*

*whole of Tawheed by the terms and structures that we have discussed.* Not certain aspects of it. And this comprehensive, all inclusive Tawheed does not exit from what we have already mentioned of the various terms and structures and what meanings and concepts they carry<sup>34</sup>. Pay attention to this and understand this well O Sunni. Understand this well and the error and misguidance of the Activists, the callers to al-Haakimiyyah and their argument will become apparently clear to you. The Qutubi Heresy will become apparent to

---

<sup>34</sup> **THE PERMANENT COMMITTEE ON TAWHEED UL-HAAKIMIYYAH**

**Question:** "Some people, from the callers, have begun giving importance to mentioning 'Tawheedul-Haakimiyyah' in addition to the three well-known categories of Tawheed. So does this fourth category enter within the three categories? or not ' such that we make it a separate category which we must give (extra) importance to?

And it is said that Shaikh Muhammad ibn 'Abdul-Wahhaab gave attention to Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah in his time when he saw that the people fell short of Tawheed in that aspect, and that Imaam Ahmad in his time gave attention to Tawheedul-Asmaa was-Sifaat when he saw the people falling short of Tawheed in that aspect. But as for today then the people fall short with regard to Tawheedul-Haakimiyyah, so therefore we must give attention to it. So how correct is this saying?"

**Answer:** "Tawheed is of three categories: Tawheedur-Ruboobiyyah, Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah and Tawheedul-Asmaa was-Sifaat, and there is no fourth category. And judging by what Allaah sent down comes under Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah since it is from the types of worship due to Allaah, the One free of all imperfections, and all of the types of worship fall under Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah. Then making 'al-Haakimiyyah' a separate category is an innovated matter, which has not been the saying of any of the scholars as far as we know.

However there were some of them who generalised and said that Tawheed is of two classes: Tawheed of things known and affirmed (al-Ma'rifah wal-Ithbaat) - and it is Tawheedur-Ruboobiyyah and Tawheedul-Asmaa was-Sifaat; and Tawheed of purpose and intentions (at-Talab wal-Qasd) - and it is Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah. Then there are others who particularise and so place Tawheed in three categories, as has preceded, and Allaah knows best.

So it is obligatory to give attention to all of Tawheedul-Uloohiyyah, and to begin by forbidding shirk, since it is the greatest of sins and annuls all of the deeds, and a person upon it will remain for ever in the Fire. Also all of the Prophets began with the command to worship Allaah alone and the forbiddance of shirk; and Allaah has commanded us to follow their way and to proceed upon their methodology in da'wah and the rest of the affairs of the deen. So giving attention to tawheed with its three categories is obligatory in every time, since shirk and denial (ta'teel) of the names and attributes are still found, indeed they occur very often and their danger increases towards the end of time, and the seriousness of these two is a matter hidden from many of the Muslims, and those who call to these two are many and active. So occurrence of shirk is not something restricted to the time of Shaikh Muhammad ibn 'Abdul-Wahhaab, nor is divestment (ta'teel) of the names and attributes restricted to the time of Imaam Ahmad, rahimahullaah, as occurs in the question. Rather their danger has increased and their prevalence has grown in Muslim societies today. So they are in the greatest need of those who will forbid from falling into them and who will make clear their danger. Whilst knowing that being upright upon the commands of Allaah and avoidance of what He forbids and applying His Sharee'ah, all of that falls under realisation of Tawheed and remaining free from shirk.

And may Allaah extol and send peace upon our Prophet Muhammad and his true followers and his Companions."

Taken from 'al-Muslimoon,' no. 639, 25th of Dhul-Hijjah 1417H which corresponds to Friday the 2nd of May 1997.

you, if Allaah wills. But the Activists desire to make understanding Tawheed subject to Ijtihad, such that they can be left alone to devise their political agendas.

Al-Haakimiyyah, from the point of view of the right of Allaah, comes under Tawheed ul-Ilm wal-Ma'rifah, or Tawheed ur-Ruboobiyyah specifically in the sense that only He legislates. From the point of view of the servants it comes under Tawheed ul-Qasd wal-Iraadah, or Tawheed ul-Uloohiyyah in the sense that the Servants must only judge by what He has revealed in the Book in the Sunnah, in all of the affairs of life – that is in creed, worship, manhaj, hudood, dealings and so on. And no one escapes from this, the ruler or the ruled.

However, the Khawaarij make al-Haakimiyyah the most special characteristic of the characteristics of Tawheed al-Uloohiyyah, then they advance it above the rest, and then make it an independent category. And all of this is for political aims and agendas. For alongside all of this what do we see emanating from them? Defending and aggrandizing the Khawaarij, the likes of Sayyid Qutb, Muhammad Qutb, Muhammad Suroor and others. Showing lenience to groups of the Khawaarij, like Jamaa'at ul-Jihaad an at-Takfir wal-Hijrah and so no. Making takfeer of the sinners. Making takfir of all the Rulers in absolute terms, without resorting to tafseel. Calling for open rejection (which is the beginning of khurooj, rebellion, using the example of Dhul-Khuwaisarah at-Tamimi at that!!), not obeying those in authority in that which is good, and calling upon the youth not to do that – and so on. Then there is no doubt that they advance al-Haakimiyyah for political agendas, as Imaam al-Albaani noted about them.

In addition to that these Activists have opposed the methodology of the Prophets in bringing about rectification, reform and the fulfilment of Allaah's promise. And we have covered this extensively in what has already preceded. And they have feigned ignorance of what exists in the world of the Major Shirk, and the Sins and Disobedience and the Wicked Innovations – all of which have played a part in Allaah's humiliation of the Muslims –and He will never remove it until they return to their Deen – that which is Tawheed and the Sunnah. And the Sinful, Tyrant Rulers are a manifestation of Allaah's humiliation of the Ummah.

It is surely amazing that the Khawaarij of Egypt call for the judgement to belong to Allaah alone and for the establishment of the Haakimiyyah of Allaah, and then in their very midst there are the graves of Hussain, Badawi, Sinjar, Tusuqi, Zainab and others – all being worshipped and called upon. And this applies in most of the Muslim countries<sup>35</sup>.

---

<sup>35</sup> As Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan stated, **“Thus it is necessary for these groups to correct their concepts and understanding by referring back to the Book and the Sunnah, in order to know the methodology of the Messengers in calling to Allaah.** For indeed Allaah - the One free from all imperfections - informed that correct rule and sovereignty, which is the central part of the call of the former jamaa 'ah whom we mentioned, **cannot be achieved except after correcting aqeedah, such that all worship is for Allaah alone and worship of everything else is abandoned.** Allaah - the Most High - says:

**Allaah has promised to those amongst you who truly have Imaan (true faith and belief) and act in obedience to Allaah and His Messenger, that He will grant them rulership upon the earth, just as He**

Since the days of Kamal Attaturk, the need for understanding tauhid al-haakimiya is clear to those of sound understanding. Anyone who "canonizes" three and rejects any others in spite of the validity of the underlying proofs has spoken without any authority from Allah - kaa'in man kaan.

Morgan, you have not gone back far enough in history. The very first of affairs of Islaam to be corrupted were the rule and rulership.

The Messenger of Allaah (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) said, "The handholds of Islaam will be demolished one by one, and every time one of them is demolished, the people will hold on tightly to the one that follows it. The first one to be demolished is the rule (al-hukm) and the last of them will be the prayer." (Imaam Ahmad (5/251), Ibn Hibban (6715), with a good (jayyid) chain of narration.)

And Ibn Hibban brought this hadeeth under the chapter heading, "A mention of the reports that the first breakage of the handholds of the Islaam to appear from the direction of the rulers (Umaraa) is the corruption of rulership and the rulers (fasaad ul-hukm wal-hukkaam)."

The need for understanding Tawheed ul-Haakimiyyah would have arisen – in Morgan's line of reasoning – at the earliest times of the Muslim Ummah, when the rule and rulership were destroyed, and likewise the need would have arisen when fanaticism and blind-following of madhhabs became rooted in the Ummah. But since he is ignorant of the Salafi Manhaj and the Methodology of the Prophets in Calling to Allaah and the way in which Allaah's creation operates and in which His promise is fulfilled, then it is not surprising that Morgan should continue in his confusion. Since the time when the rule was first corrupted from the direction of the rulers (many, many centuries ago!!), we have never seen any of our Salaf raise high the banner of al-Haakimiyyah, call for political parties and political rallies, enjoin open demonstrations, call for "social justice" and enjoin entry into Parliamentary elections, or the setting up of parties for that. We have never seen any precedence for the Ikhwani, Qutubi, Bannaawi da'wah of Safar al-Hawali, Salman al-Awdah and Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq.

### **Rectification of the Affairs**

In the vast majority of Muslim countries there is the Major Shirk. Yet despite all of that, there are many "political" parties who by a "political" process - entering into the

---

**granted it to those before them, and that He will establish their Religion for them and grant them the authority to practice their Religion which He chose and ordered them with. And He will certainly change their situation to one of security, after their fear. Providing that they worship and obey Me, not associating anything else in worship with Me. Then, whoever rejects this favour by disobedience to their Lord - then they are the rebellious transgressors.** Soorah an-Noor 24:55

**So these people wish to establish the Islaamic State before purifying the lands of idolatrous beliefs which take the form of worship of the dead, and devotion to the tombs - such as is no different to the worship of al-Laat, al-Uzzaa and the third of them Manaata, rather it is worse. So they are attempting that which is impossible...**" (Introduction to 'Manhaj ul-Anbiyaa' of Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee).

parliaments, working alongside Ahl ul-Bid'ah such as the Raafidah, the Soofees and Grave-Worshippers - are trying to seek the thrones of power, in order to establish the Islamic authority and its Sharee'ah(!). This is not the way of the Prophets. What is obligatory upon all those groups in these particular lands is to follow the methodology of the Prophets and to purify the lands of the idolatrous practices and the beliefs entailing Shirk and innovation. Then the promise of Allaah will come into effect. **Then will Allaah grant them rulership upon the earth, just as He granted it to those before them, and He will establish their Religion for them and grant them the authority to practice their Religion that He chose and ordered them with. And He will certainly change their situation to one of security, after their fear.** And in the absence of all of that, they may try whatever they like of "collective work", entering the parliaments, calling to rebellion and so on, but never will they achieve success and never will Allaah allow them to inherit the Earth. This is Allaah's Law. It is from al-Haakimiyyah to work by Allaah's Law and to traverse the Sunnah. This is why the callers to al-Haakimiyyah are the first one's who oppose it from the very beginning.

As for those countries which are free from the Major Shirk – except for the presence of certain groupings in these countries such as the Raafidah and some Soofee elements, who do not have any strength – and in which there is to be found some Sharee'ah rule, in greater or lesser degrees, such as some of the Gulf states – then what is obligatory upon them is to adhere to the Sharee'ah in the methodologies of rectification. Not the ways of Muhammad Suroor, Muhammad Qutb, Safar al-Hawali and Salman al-Awdah, which is the Qutubi, Khariji way. But the Salafi way.

**Firstly**, it is necessary for them to build upon what is already there of goodness, and to have patience, and for them to realise that the way for them to remove whatever they are in of oppression and hardships is to remove what their own souls are committing of oppression and disobedience, firstly.

Shaikh Muqbil commented upon the following verse: **"And Allāh puts forward the example of a township, that dwelt secure and well content; its provision coming to it in abundance from every place, but it (its people) denied the Favours of Allāh (with ungratefulness). So Allāh made it taste the extreme of hunger (famine) and fear, because of that which they (its people) used to do."** (An-Nahl 16:112) saying, "This verse contains both the disease and the cure".

Meaning, that as ungratefulness and denial of the favours of Allaah emerge on account of sin and disobedience, Allaah removes the safety and security from above – as a result of which they are made to face fear and hunger. This is how "social justice" is removed(!)

And there is also what occurs in the Qur'aan – as has preceded - that Allaah does not change the condition of people unless they change the condition of their own souls. And this is different to what the Qutubite motto and slogan is, "Allaah does not change the condition of people unless they change the condition of their governments".

Stated Ibn Abil-'Izz al-Hanafi, "And as for adhering to obedience to them (the Rulers), even if they commit oppression, then this is because the evils and harms that arise on account of rebelling against them, is numerous times more than that which occurs as a result of the oppression of the Rulers themselves. Rather, in having patience over their oppression there is expiation of sins, and a multiplication of the reward. For Allaah did not empower them over us, except due to the corruption in our actions, and the recompense for an action is its like (al-jazaa'u min jins il-'amal). Hence, it is upon us to strive (ijtihaad) in seeking forgiveness, making repentance and rectification of our actions. Allaah the Most High said, **"And whatever affliction befalls you, then it is from what your hands have earned, yet He pardons many"** ... and He the Most High said, **"...And whatever evil befalls you, then it is from your own soul"**, and He the Most High said, **"And thus do we turn some of the oppressors against others on account of what they used to earn"**. Hence, if the subjects (of a state) wish to save themselves from the oppression of the tyrannical ruler, then let them abandon oppression themselves." (Sharh Aqeedat ut-Tahaawiyah).

These are indeed beautiful words. Of course, to Qutubite Apologeticism, this is defeatism and leniency and this is what renders us "Qadariyyah"(!) and Murji'ah(!).

**Secondly**, it is necessary for them to take heed of the advice of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) concerning the sinful, tyrannical rulers and the manner of advising and correcting them, and not to take the advice of Suroor, Qutb, al-Hawali or al-Awdah who but displayed loyalty to Ahl ul-Bid'ah, the likes of Muhammad al-Mis'ari and others and employed their assistance in the fulfilment of their plot and agenda and who took as their role and guide the action of Dhul-Khuwaisarah at-Tamimi in his conduct with the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). It is necessary for them to stick to the likes of Imaam Ibn Baaz and Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen and others, not the newly-arisen, foolish-minded ones. Since, the details of this issue are only too well-known we do not need to mention the relevant proofs, since they are manifestly clear in the Sunnah, in the Companions, those after them from the Tabi'een, the Imaams after them and the Shaikhs of Islaam in every age and era<sup>36</sup>.

---

<sup>36</sup> Shaykh Abdul Azeez Ibn Baaz, (hafidhahullaah) was asked, "Is it from the manhaj (methodology) of the Salaf to criticise the Rulers from the minbar (the pulpit)? And what is the manhaj of the Salaf with respect to advising the Rulers?"

He responded: "It is not from the manhaj of the Salaf to publicise the faults of the Rulers and to mention such things from the pulpit because that leads to confusion and disorder and the absence of hearing and obeying the ruler in what is good. It also results in (the people) becoming engrossed (with these matters, arguing and debating) which causes harm and produces no benefit.

The followed Path with the Salaf, however is to give naseehah (advice) with respect to the matters which are between themselves and the leader, writing to him or by reaching him through the scholars who keep in touch with him (to advise him) until the ruler is directed towards the good. Repelling the evil occurs without mentioning the doer of the evil.

The more learned and careful of the Qutubites themselves do not dispute this – and how can they(!) since their plot would be uncovered from the very beginning – but this is diplomacy on their behalf. However, their agenda and ideology causes them to reply in turn, “but this is for the Muslim ruler only”, indicating what is with them of hidden takfir. Or they say that these narrations that mention the forbiddance of open rejection against the Rulers and the giving of advice to them secretly are “a word of truth by which falsehood is intended”, meaning that these narrations from the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and the aathaar from the Companions are used in falsehood. And this is indeed a mighty slander against the Sunnah and its carriers. For if it is known that if no manifest kufr has appeared from the Rulers in the countries which we have mentioned, and no Scholars have made takfeer, having agreed upon this takfeer, then all of what Allaah’s Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi sallam) has mentioned applies – even if it may cause the begrudged nose of Qutubiyyah to be rubbed and dragged along the ground. This is the way they argue with us and try to nullify the narrations by the dark whisperings of their souls and the bankruptcy of their intellects. And then Satan leads them further astray and suggests to them, “they are spies”, “they are being paid”, “they are agents” and so on.

This is their condition. They abandon the Sunnah and make mockery of those who follow it and call to adherence to it.

---

So fornication, drinking of intoxicants and the taking of usury are curbed without mentioning the one who does such things. Warding off the evil and warning and the people against it is sufficient without it being mentioned that such and such a person does it, whether he is a ruler or other than the ruler.

And when the fitnah occurred in the time of 'Uthmaan (radiallaahu 'anhu), some of the people said to Usaamah ibn Zaid (radiallaahu 'anhu), “Will you not speak to 'Uthmaan?” So he replied, “You think that I will not talk to him without letting you know about it (also). Indeed, I will certainly talk to him regarding that which concerns me and him without initiating a matter which I do not love to be the first to initiate.”

And when they (the Khawaarij) opened up the evil in the time of 'Uthmaan (radiallaahu 'anhu) and rejected 'Uthmaan openly, the fitnah, the killing and the mischief, which has not ceased to affect the people to this day, was brought about. And this caused the fitnah to occur between 'Alee and Mu'aawiyah and 'Uthmaan (radiallaahu 'anhu) was killed for these reasons.

(Futhermore) a large number of Companions and others besides them were killed due to this open rebellion and the open proclamation of the faults (of the ruler), until the people began to hate the one charged with authority over them and killed him. We ask Allah for success.” [End of the words of the Shaykh (hafidhahullaah). Taken from Al-Ma'loom min Waajib il-'Ilaaqah bain al Haakim wal-Mahkoom, (pp. 22-23).]

It is authentically reported from the Messenger (salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam) in the hadeeth of 'Iyaad Ibn Ghunm who said, “The Messenger of Allaah (salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam) said, “Whoever desires to advise the one with authority then he should not do so openly, rather he should take him by the hand and take him into seclusion (and then advise him). And if he accepts (the advice) from him then (he has achieved his objective) and if not, then he has fulfilled that which was a duty upon him.” (Reported by Ahmad (3/403) and Ibn Abee 'Aasim (2/521) with a Saheeh isnaad.)

Pay attention that we do not make the same observation about all the Muslim countries present today. We differentiate between them on the basis of the strength and maturity of the da'wah to Tawheed and the Sunnah, and the existence of Sharee'ah Laws. We differentiate between all of them to such an extent that we arrive at numerous categories of countries in which different conditions, observations and analyses apply. We do not treat Syria like Saudi Arabia. Nor Egypt like Kuwait. Nor Turkey(!) to Pakistan. It is important that we make a distinction between all of them in this way!! We are a people of *tafseel* (distinction, separation, detail). They are a people of *itlaaq* (generalisation, absolution). And on this basis, we say that the da'wah required in each country varies. And all of that must be performed upon the dictates of the Book, the Sunnah and Salafiyyah, not the dictates of Bid'ah, Qutubiyah and Khaarijiyyah ['Asriyyah].

### **The Call to Khurooj - Rebellion**

Morgan continues to expound upon his true doctrine:

It is mere sophistry to debate whether this is kufr, kufr duna kufr or just fisaad fiy al-ardh. On the practical level, it makes no difference. All can be fought physically and in all other ways by the believers if they persist in their 'udwaan against Allah and His deen. Abu Hanifah, Ibn Katheer and Ibn Taimia all agree on the legitimacy of fighting those who destroy Allah's deen on this earth and institute its opposite, partially or totally. They are surely of the salaf before you.

In reality, this is a call to khurooj, but disguised. Pay attention, the above words are a call to khurooj. First of all he calls it mere sophistry to adhere to the tafseel of the Salaf in these great and serious issues. "It makes no difference..." he says on the practical level. This is because to him "all can be fought physically". And when he says "and in all other ways by the believers", then this is a call to that which Allaah's Messenger forbade. That is rebelling against the Ruler, publicising his faults, inciting the people against him and so on. He is saying, let's forget about adhering to the tafseel of the Salaf on these issues of takfir and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, it's mere sophistry to debate all of this (!). This is what the forelock of Morgan opines. Perhaps to Morgan, the loss of 100,000 lives to date in Algeria is a small affair such that he can so boldly make his statements above, which clearly lead to the kinds of calamities in the Muslims lands that occurred in Algeria. We are a people of *tafseel* (distinction, separation, detail). They are a people of *itlaaq* (generalisation, absolution). We are a people of *fiqh*, they are a people of confusion and chaos.

They are a people who have no fiqh, no understanding.

Shaikh Sali al-Fawzaan said, **"Take note of the reason that has lead them (the Khawaarij) to fall into this, namely that they do not have understanding (of the religion). This is because they are a group who have striven hard in worship, in prayer, fasting, reciting the Qur'aan and they also have very strong zeal, however, they do not understand (laa yafqahoon), and this is the calamity. Hence, it is necessary that striving hard in worship and piety (wara') should be alongside understanding (fiqh) of the religion and having knowledge."** (Lumhah anil-Firaq).



Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen was asked by Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Misri, "A new orientation has appeared amongst the youth and that is unrestricted, generalised takfir of the one who does not rule by what Allaah has revealed. So if you were to explain to us the manhaj of the Salaf in the issue of the one who does not rule by what Allaah has revealed. And also your advice to the one who to whom this viewpoint becomes appealing?" He replied, "The true reality is that this matter is extremely dangerous. Takfir of a ruler without any Sharee'ah proof. And this is the manhaj of the Khawaarij. And the word of kufr (i.e. making a judgement of kufr) is not an easy or light one. Every person who makes takfir of a ruler or one who is ruled over, and he is not like that in reality, then this takfir will fall back upon this person, either immediately or later..." (Cassette: "As'ilat Abil-Hasan al-Misri al-Ma'rabi lish-Shaikhain Ibn Baz wa Ibn Uthaimeen").

And this is their calamity. As for those whom Morgan has referenced from the Scholars of the past, then this is the way of all the Ahl ul-Ahwaa. Bring us the texts and then let us analyse them, and then let us investigate into all the other statements of these scholars related to this topic, so that we have a comprehensive view, and then let us throw all of that against the Book and the Sunnah. Then you will find that you will be prevented from your unrestricted, absolute, generalised takfir and your calls to khurooj. And here O Sunni, you should note carefully how and why the Qutubites tie these issues together. They have to prove that replacing the Sharee'ah is major kufr unconditionally, unrestrictedly, absolutely – then they go around in circles and "imply" takfir, not too dissimilar to the way in which Morgan has illustrated above, and then justify khurooj and taking up arms. All due to emotionalism and zeal.

A fair share of them are merely driven by sentiment and venting of anger, and in this state they are led to utter statements, not too dissimilar to Morgan's, the true meanings, imports and implications of which they do not realise at the time they make them. This shows that their mental state and condition is not in conformity with the Sunnah and the concepts of Salafiyyah.

As for replacement of the Sharee'ah, then this has its own discussion and it does not belong to this discourse. But know that the Biased Partisans have nothing to support them, for the proof is neither with them nor for them. They have nothing in the Book and the Sunnah that supports them. They forbid us from taqleed, and then fall into it themselves by drawing upon the words of the Scholars. Words and statements for which evidences ought to be sought from the Sunnah, which is the Salafi way, not by which an argument is made, which is the Qutubi way. **They seek the sayings of men as evidences and they do not seek evidences for the sayings of men**<sup>37</sup>. The reader is referred to Minhaaj us-Sunnah Issue 2, which contains Shaikh Khalid al-Anbari's excellent reply to the Permanent Committee's verdict on these issues of ruling by secular laws.

---

<sup>37</sup> This is the saying of Ibn Taymiyyah that evidences are sought for the sayings of men and the sayings of men are not sought for evidences, as occurs in Raf' ul-Malaam.

## Going Round in Circles

They ought to be asked. Let us take each of the Rulers of the Gulf States, one by one. Now which of them is a kaafir, apostate in your view. Do you make takfir or not make takfir of the specific individual. They hastily retreat and do not make takfir, and claim it is a fabrication against them that they make takfir(!). Or they will not answer clearly and start with the usual emotional rhetoric “they are wicked”, “they are in league with Iblis”, “do you still think they are Muslim” and so on. This is their way of argumentation. This has been the experience with them. This is how they are. Pay attention. This is how they behave. However, they then come out with statements like those of Morgan above, all of which but indicate that they hide takfir, and that they oppose the manhaj of the Salaf on these issues. The Sunnah restricts them and contains them but they wish to break out. We are a people of *tafseel* (distinction, separation, detail). They are a people of *itlaaq* (generalisation, absolution). We seek, clarification and clarity, they seek generalisation, ambiguities and confusion.

This is why their interpretation of the situation is that “the rulers are fighting alongside Iblis to destroy Allaah’s religion”, “they are in league with the CIA”, “they are destroying Allaah’s deen”, “they are part of the New World Order” and so on. Think Morgan. Some sophistication is required here. Allaah removes the *tamkeen* (establishment) that He has given to the Believers and replaces it with fear, loss, hunger, humiliation, and debasement – when they change the condition of their souls. And then he restores it when they restore and rectify the condition of their souls. Allaah gives *tamkeen* and He removes it. Have you not carefully reflected upon His saying in Surah Noor (24):55. Have you not carefully observed the wording Allaah has used and chosen? Have you not reflected upon the hadeeth of the Ibn ‘Umar concerning the ‘Eenah transaction and the humiliation that Allaah causes for the Muslims, that which He will never lift until they return to their deen. Have you not considered the words of Imaam Maalik, which are the basis and contain the blueprint for the rectification of the latter part of the Ummah? Don’t get us wrong, we do not abrogate or nullify the Sharee’ah judgement of takfir, or takfir of the Rulers, but we adhere to the tafseel of the Salaf and we treat the matter as a great and serious one, and we make sure we are not driven by sentiment, zeal and emotion, because lives are at stake here O Morgan, innocent lives at that, lives which may be cheap in the eyes of some.

After the imprisonment of Abbaasi Madani and Alee bin Haaj in Algeria, and after the turmoil that appeared and butchery that took place (this being the result of the wonderful cassette recordings and understanding of the fiqh ul-waaqi’ of the political activists and their encouragement for the arrival of “the dawn of a new era” in Algeria), stated the Revolutionist and Activist Thinker, “Do you know how much Algeria has spent (in human lives) as a state and as an Ummah? **How much as it spent as a price for the enmity shown to the men of Islaam, Abbaasi Madani and Alee bin Haaj and others who are the symbols of the daw’ah and the symbols of Islaam? Ten thousand only were killed!!! And still there were foreigners amongst them!!**” (Salman al-Awdah in the cassette: “Mahrjaan Buraidah”, on the first side of second cassette).

You still have not learnt a lesson from what the hands of the neo-Qutubites and their mentors did in Algeria, O Morgan. We are a people of *tafseel* (distinction, separation, detail). They are a people of *itlaaq* (generalisation, absolution). We are a people of *fiqh*, they are a people of confusion and chaos.

### **Being Justly Balanced**

This does not mean that we do not adopt the other subsidiary and ancillary ways and means in order to repel all of this humiliation within the Ummah. For example, we make the Jihaad that is kifaayah. We observe the plots and plans of the Infidels and try to be weary of them so that they are foiled – and this is only for the Erudite Imaams, not those with the affectations and agendas of Qutubiyah – who have something else in mind and who in reality are the most ignorant of “fiqh ul-waqi” as they themselves demonstrated in the Afghanistan, Algerian disasters and the Gulf War. We try to advise and correct the Rulers in the prescribed Sharee’ah manner. If we see manifest clear kufr from any of the Rulers, we return to the Senior Erudite Imaams and adhere to their advice, to make sure the greater good or the lesser of two evils predominates. We take a lesson from Algeria in this regard, where the Qutubites, Partisans and others from the Khawaarij threw the advice of the Imaams of our time behind their backs resulting in destruction, chaos and great calamities. We co-operate amongst each other, but upon the Sunnah and the Salafi manhaj, not merely for the sake of co-operation with all and sundry. We make recourse to the Senior Scholars in all of that.

Yes, we adhere to all of these affairs in the current situation where we know Allaah has humiliated us. We do not sit and do nothing. And these are ways and means to remove and help relieve the “symptoms”. Pay attention, to remove the “symptoms”. But these affairs do not remove the cause and utilising these affairs is not the primary way of establishing Allaah’s authority in the land. We do not make these affairs, in and of themselves, the actual basis of rectification – as the neo-Qutubites, Bannaawites, Shurocrats and Partisans have – and the explanation of all of this has already preceded. This is why the most erudite and perceptive of Imaams, those who have a profound understanding of Allaah’s threats and promises and the ways in which Creation operates and the link of all of that to Tawheed, Ikhlās and the Sunnah, this is why they exaggerate the affair of Tasfiyah wat-Tarbiyah and the call to Tawheed and the Sunnah over the affairs such as Jihaad, Political work and so on. We are a people of *tafseel* (distinction, separation, detail). They (the sentimentalists) are a people of *itlaaq* (generalisation, absolution).

They take a concept that is general, such as “collective work and co-operation” and leave it at that, so that they include the Innovators and groups and sects in their “collective work” – as is the way of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq and Salman al-Awdah. And we throw this concept against the Book and the Sunnah upon the understanding of the Salaf. So we only perform “collective work” and “co-operate” based upon the Salafi Manhaj in the affairs of da’wah. We are a people of *tafseel* (distinction, separation, detail). They (the sentimentalists) are a people of *itlaaq* (generalisation, absolution).

They take the concept of political activity and work and leave it at that such that they allow themselves to enter into the democracy of the Infidels as a matter of principle and by necessity and as a manhaj to be followed. Or the allowance of political movements within the Muslim lands – all of which seek the thrones of power, in order to establish the Islamic Sharee'ah - only causing more confusion and chaos. So they co-operate with all and sundry, Mushrik, Mu'tadi', Zindeeq alike. We take this concept and throw it against the Book and the Sunnah. What politics is there in the absence of any Sharee'ah rule? What politics do they mean and want. The Sharee'ah politics? Then in the current situation, the framework (i.e. the Islamic State) does not even exist for them to be involved in the legitimate Sharee'ah politics. And then if it existed, then it would not be left for the likes of them or every common person and nor would "democracy" exist, such that the da'wah of Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq would exist. In such a situation the political affairs would be the concern of the Rulers and the Scholars. But we do not have the required framework. Rather, in the view of the Qutubites, all the Muslim lands are "apostate states" as opined by their theoreticians, because of the existence of secular laws in these lands, to greater or lesser degrees. By Allaah, how great is their confusion and how severe is their contradiction.

As Imaam al-Albaani stated, "And if 'Abdur-Rahmaan were to be asked, and he was a student of mine in the Islamic University, if he were asked or if I had the opportunity to meet him, 'Do you say that the goal justifies the means?' Then he would say, 'No,' because this is a principle of kufr. **But if we direct his attention to the fact that he acts in accordance with it, and his life, and what he declares permissible, and that which he clearly states to be permissible from some of the forbidden things, then this is implementation of this principle which is such that no Muslim can consent to it. So he must reject it. But we say, 'What is the benefit of saying one thing and doing something else?'**

So therefore we ask for this brother of ours, and for those who have been mislead by his example into contravening the Sharee'ah in some rulings, we ask Allaah to guide and grant us and them that we truly follow the way of the Book and the Sunnah, upon the manhaj of as-Salafus-Saalih, and I return to saying that this circumvention of certain Sharee'ah rulings is contrary to the way of the Muslims throughout the ages.

**And whoever contradicts and opposes the Messenger after the right path has been shown clearly to him, and follows other than the believer's way. We shall keep him in the path he has chosen, and burn him in Hell - what an evil destination. Soorah an-Nisaa (4):115**

So we ask Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic, to make us aware of the way of the first Muslims, and guides us to proceed upon that way." End of al-Albaani's words. (Cassette: "What the People of knowledge say About 'Abdur-Rahmaan 'Abdul-Khaaliq")

So when the framework does not exist, then what politics are they calling to? The politics of the disbelievers. The democracy of the Infidels. The Activism of the seekers of the thrones of power. The Sharee'ah forbids this. So we are a people of *tafseel* (distinction,

separation, detail). They (the sentimentalists, activists) are a people of *itlaaq* (generalisation, absolutism).

And in all the issues of methodology, this is what has separated us from them, walhamdulillah.

### **Ignorance of the Salafi Manhaj and the Way of the Muhadditheen: Warning the Common Folk**

Morgan illustrates this:

I have personally witnessed some of your partisans after converting to Islam for only a year or so knowing very little of what they need from Islam but able to rattle off long lists of "qutbi" and "suroori" organizations and individuals from your black list. Although they refrain from using the word "kufr", these are the TRUE "takfeeris" since the bulk of the Muslim Ummah has been labelled "deviant" in their minds. If anyone deserves the term khaarijiy, these are they. This is a clear sign for any who care to see.

When someone converts to Islaam, he understands the Kalimah, makes tasdeeq to it, knows its conditions, meanings and requirements, makes the testimony and is ready to start acting upon the pillars. He must act upon the bare minimum of what is obligatory upon him – that is the pillars and avoiding all that Allaah has made forbidden and acting upon all that He has made obligatory. Then from here, the people vary based upon their characters, personalities, backgrounds, motivations and aspirations. Some move forward quickly, others do not, some are lazy, some are strivers, some have zeal for knowledge, others don't. Some understand well, others do not... and so on. And this applies to any person who enters Islam. Whether he enters Salafiyyah straight away, or other than that from the various (deviant) orientations.

What Morgan has stated above is the usual rhetoric that is employed by the Partisans, that is the true and real Partisans. There is no argument in what he has said. It is just a scaremongering tactic. It has no substance, no weight. Firstly, name us these people you have met personally. Tell us their names. And let us see, if they actually know the bare minimum of what they need to know in order to fulfil their basic duty as a Muslim. Since, if they are fulfilling that, then they are fulfilling what is required of them, and you have no reason to find fault with. So who are these people? Name them and tell us about them so we can refer to them and see what their level is? We are a people of *tafsil*, they (the Qutubite partisans) are a people of *itlaaq*.

It is great joy to us that many of these new Muslims who after one year are able to know Qutubiyyah and Surooriyyah from Salafiyyah, and who are able to know at least, shady organisations who make an open display of Salafiyyah, but hide Qutubiyyah and Surooriyyah underneath – such as IANA, al-Muntada and others.

By the way Morgan, we here in the UK, the Salafis, amongst us are those who worked with al-Muntada for five years, were on their Committee and part of the "International

Surooriyyah". We have seen how they operate, the secret pledges of allegiance, the ideologies of takfir and khurooj, the partisanship, the way people are recruited. Morgan brother, we speak from experience and knowledge. We have amongst our ranks associates of Suroor and his muqallids and mureeds. The Salafis who were with him, but saw through him and his disciples walhamudlillaah. So we understand the ties and links between all these organisations walhamulillaah. Morgan, we live here in the United Kingdom which houses and shelters all of the straying Innovators. Those who make hijrah from the Islamic lands to come and live under the protection of the Queen. Muhammad al-Mis'ari, Muhammad Suroor, Omar Bakri to name but a few. We also have many of the North African Khawaarij here as well O Morgan. They wage a war against us. We try to teach the people in our communities Tawheed, and they want to teach them Haakimiyyah and Takfir and Khurooj. Understand this well O Morgan. We experience and exercise this. We are aware of the way the ideas of takfir and khurooj are being hidden and transported by "Islamic Organisations". Besides O Morgan, most of the organisations that are set up today and that have constitutions and regulations and memberships and so on, they are in opposition to the Sunnah, and contain Hizbiyyah. So they are forbidden to begin with. Let alone their being forbidden due to their promotion of deviant ideas in their own midst.

So it is a great joy that an ignorant Muslim who does not know these affairs and which are hidden to him, is saved from all of that. Regardless of whether an organisation is Qutubi or Suroori or Soofee or Aqlaaneer or Tahreeri or Naqshabandi, or whatever. It is indeed a great joy. And how can it not be O Morgan.

Ayyoob (as-Sakhtiyaanee) said: **"Indeed from the well-being of a youth or a non-Arab is that Allah should guide them to a scholar from the companions of the Sunnah."** (al-Laalikaa'ee, no. 31). Ibn Shawdhab said : **"Indeed from the blessings of Allah upon a youth who seeks to worship Allah is that he is granted as a brother a companion of the Sunnah who encourages him upon it."** (al-Laalikaa'ee, no. 32).

All praise is due to Allaah who guided us to the students of Imaam Ibn Baaz, those of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen, those of Imaam al-Albaani, those of Shaikh Muqbil, the Kuwaiti Shaikhs and many others – all of whom warned us of Hizbiyyah and its people and its organisations and plots and plans. This is what enraged the partisans, that they were not able to recruit us and make us part of them and their hizbiyyah. It enraged them that we did not respond to their Qutubi call of al-Haakimiyyah and that we adhered to the words of Imaam al-Albaani, Shaikh Ibn Baaz and Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen. It enraged them when we spread the new verdicts of the Scholars on the absence of co-operation with the various groups present today, like Ikhwaan and Tabligh. It enraged them when we spread the verdict of Imaam Ibn Baaz on Ikhwan and Tabligh being from the seventy-two sects. So they became enraged walhamdulillaah –for they had aforesaid tried to take us away from the Book and the Sunnah, with their wicked hizbiyyah and their loyalty to many from Ahl ul-Bid'ah wal-Ahwaa. And then they accused us of taqleed(!). We did not respond to their innovation, because we do not believe in performing taqleed of those whose da'wah has no basis in the Book and the Sunnah. They brought no proof. So we did not follow them. So we did not do taqleed of them. This enraged them and caused them to accuse us of taqleed

of the Inheritors of the Prophets. But these were issues in which they had to bring the proof for their newly devised da'wah. **Not the other way around.** But they brought nothing. So how can we be accused of taqleed?!

Stated the Imaam, the Muhaddith, the Thorn in the Throats of those born of the Awakening (Sahwah) of Qutubism and the neo-Kharijite Propaganda Machine, ““What is occurring now amidst the debates between many individuals regarding what has been called... or concerning this new bid’ah called “al-Muwaazanah” (counterbalancing between the good and bad points) with respect to criticising men. I say: Criticism either occurs in the biography of an individual which is a “historical” biography in which case it is necessary to mention what is both good and bad with respect to the individual. **However, when the intent behind the biographical detail of an individual is to warn the Muslims, and especially the general folk who do not have any knowledge pertaining to men and their defects - in fact it might even be the case that (this individual who is being warned against) might have a good and acceptable reputation with the common folk – however, he is concealing an evil aqidah or evil habits, yet the common folk do not know any of this about this man...** In this particular situation this innovation, which has been given the title of, “al-Muwaazanah” these days is not employed. This is because the intent here is to give advice (to the Muslims) and the intent is not to give a comprehensive and exhaustive biographical details. Whoever studies the Prophetic Sunnah and Seerah will not have any doubts about the futility of making this innovated precept of today absolute (in all circumstances), which is “al-Muwaazanah”. (Cassette: “Man Haamil Raayah al-Jarh wat-Ta’deel Fil-Asr al-Haadir”)

This is what enrages the Biased Partisans, the Qutubites, Shurocrats and Hardened Bannaawites, those upon innovatory ways and sinister agendas and opposition to the Sunnah. And in turn they use this ridiculous argument of new Muslims knowing all the deviant organisations and so on.

### **True Takfeeris?!**

But then Morgan transgresses all limits and exceeds the limits of reason:

Although they refrain from using the word "kufr", these are the TRUE "takfeeris" since the bulk of the Muslim Ummah has been labelled "deviant" in their minds. If anyone deserves the term khaarijiy, these are they. This is a clear sign for any who care to see.

As for his first sentence, then it is a clear contradiction. A “**true**” takfeeri is one who makes takfir of people without adhering to Sharee’ah principles and who makes takfeer of the Rulers in absolute terms and also takfir of the sinners and others. Indeed this is a great slander and mighty fabrication against the Salafis. So saying “Although they refrain from using the word ‘kufr’...” contradicts “...these are the true “takfeeris”...”. Morgan, this is a clear contradiction. Fine, its words and semantics. But you held us to task for what we wrote, then do you expect us to be unjust with you and not take you to task in the same manner. The principle in all languages is that we take words (and sentences) upon their

apparent meanings and that we do not become Baatinians<sup>38</sup> in our utterance and speech. What is a true takfeeri in your estimation? Is it the likes of Jamaa'at ul-Jihaad? Is it at-Takfir wal-Hijrah? Is it those who perform takfir of the sinners? Pray tell, in Allaah's name O Morgan, What is a true "takfeeri"?! Once you have conceptualised that in your mind, then tell me, are the Salafis true "takfeeris". Leave aside semantics for a minute.

In reality your words are close to those of ash-Shayjee who stated, "Khawaarij with the Callers" and who stated, "And amongst these principles - that is the principles of misguidance (of the Salafis) - is that every jamaa'ah of da'wah to Allaah at the present time is an organisation of innovations and misguidance **and that they are offshoots of the sects of the pasts that were outside of Islaam**" (Khutoot al-Areedah p.3). So ash-Shayjee ascribes takfir to the Salafis, he lies upon the Salafis and ascribes takfir to them. And Morgan has followed in the same path. He ascribes "the spirit" of takfir to the Salafis.

It is truly despicable that Morgan found fault with us for putting the biased partisans like Safar and Salman in the same "bucket" as at-Takfir wal-Hijrah and then he goes and does the same thing himself with us(!). O Allaah remove this blinding hizbiyyah from this Ummah which but kills the hearts and blinds both the heart and vision. This is what we mean, O Sunni, they preach piety to others and are more in need of it themselves, wal-Iyaadhu billaah.

### **The Bulk of the Muslim Ummah Is Deviant?**

As for the bulk of the Muslim Ummah being deviant, then for a person who claims to read only the books before the 4th century Hijrah and who claims to have been upon the Salafi way for 20 years and then finds fault with this and with those who say that indeed the bulk of the Muslim Ummah is indeed deviant and has deviated from the Straight Path that Allaah's Messenger drew in the sand - then this is truly amazing. Maashaa'allaah. This is Salafiyyah?!

Ishaaq ibn Raahawaayah (d.238), the teacher of Imaam Bukhaaree, said: "If you were to ask the ignorant people about the Great Majority they would say: The majority of people. They do not know that al-Jamaa'ah is the Scholar who clings to the narrations from the Prophet and his way. So whoever is with him (the scholar) and follows him, then he is al-Jamaa'ah". (Reported by Abu Nu'aym in Hilyat ul-Awliyaah).

Imaam ash-Shaatibee (d. 790H) said: "So consider what he (Ishaaq bin Raahawaih) quotes and it will then be clear to you the error of those who think that the Jamaa'ah is the main body or the majority of people, even if there is no scholar amongst them. This is the understanding of the common people - not the understanding of the Scholars. So the person who desires right guidance in this matter should place his feet firmly in those places where slips occur, so that he does not deviate from the correct way - and there is no well-being and correct guidance except from Allaah." Al-I'tisaam (2/267)

---

<sup>38</sup> That is like the Baatiniyyah, who believe in hidden, underlying meanings behind terms.



If you were to ask Morgan, he will say that the Jamaa'ah is the vast majority of the Ummah, the bulk of the Ummah(!!).

Abdullaah Ibn al-Mubaarak (d.110H) said, "Know that I consider death to be an honour for every Muslim who meets Allaah upon the Sunnah. For to Allaah do we complain of our strangeness, the disappearance of the brothers, the scarcity of helpers and the emergence of the Innovations. To Allaah do we complain of the great calamity that has befallen this Ummah of the disappearance of the Scholars, the People of the Sunnah and of the emergence of Innovations." (Ibn Waddah al-Qurtubi in 'al-Bida' wan-Nahi Anhaa' no.39).

Morgan thinks that there are thousands of the Scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah today in all the various parts of the Earth – all of them manifestly and clearly upon the way of the Salaf in aqidah, manhaj, fiqh and ibaadah – such that the bulk of the Ummah is upon the guidance about which the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) said, "I have left you upon pure clarity. Its night is like its day. No one deviates from it except that he is destroyed..."

Al-Hasan al-Basri (d.110H) said, "For verily Ahl us-Sunnah were the fewest amongst the people in the time that has passed and they will be the fewest of people in the time that is yet to come. Those who do not go to the luxury of the people of luxury and nor to the innovations of the people of innovation and who had patience upon the Sunnah until they meet their Lord. So this is how you should be inshaa'allaah." (ad-Daarimee 1/92).

Morgan thinks that from the time of al-Hasan al-Basri and Abdullaah Ibn al-Mubaaarak till this day of ours that the Sunnah and its people became uppermost, the Scholars increased and Tawheed and the Sunnah spread such that the bulk of the Ummah today is upon the light of Tawheed and the Sunnah and that innovations in creed and manhaj and ibaadah have all but disappeared. Seventy-two of the seventy-three sects within Islaam are described with deviation, misguidance and destruction. The Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) advised Hudhayfah Ibn al-Yaman to abandon all the sects, if no Jamaa'ah and Imaam is to be found – which is in fact our time. Then comes Morgan and thinks the bulk of the Ummah is upon guidance and success. Then he belittles his own intelligence and says, "If anyone deserves the term khaarijy, these are they. This is a clear sign for any who care to see."

Maashaa'allaah, those who perform absolute takfir, those who call for revolution and rebellion, those who take Dhul-Khuwaisarah at-Tamimi as their model and guide, those who perform takfir of the sinners, all of them are safe and secure from being labelled "Khaarijyy" and they must not be likened or associated with at-Takfir wal-Hijrah and as for those who flee with their religion from Hizbiyyah and its people, avoid the sects and are careful of whom they befriend and take their knowledge from, and who know that the bulk of the Ummah is deviant, since their Messenger informed them of that and the Salaf told them that, then they are the ones who deserve the term "khaarijyy" in Morgan's Mental World, may its bubble burst for his own good. It is clear that Morgan is insensed

and is burning and has been driven to madness on account of the saying of the Imaam and Muhaddith, the Faqeeh and Shaikh ul-Islaam, the Unique Individual of the Era, that the Biased Partisans for whom Morgan shows love and hate are “**the Khawaarij of the Era**” (!!). And this is the case of all of those like Morgan in the various parts of the Earth.

Morgan, you need to rest and question yourself, wal-Iyaadhu billaah.

### **Lets Close Early...**

Though Morgan can be criticised for much more in what he wrote, what has preceded is sufficient to illustrate his true orientation and his background, his great confusion and his exaggerated anger, pure emotive zeal, and thorough lack of understanding (fiqh), in these serious and great affairs – all which has no basis upon any sound manhaj that he has acquired.

However, it would be unfair not to make mention of a few matters.

**Firstly**, his objection to our use of the pronoun “we” in the course of the discussion. This is in fact a personal preference adopted after reading Ibn al-Qayyim’s tafseer of the saying of Iblis, “I am better than him (Aadam)..” as occurs in the Qur’aan, and how the excessive use of the pronoun “I” is a sign of arrogance and self-praise. Hence, the avoidance of its usage. Of course the use of “we” is certainly not in the “royal” sense, as Morgan imagined, perhaps because he thinks it is too close tied with the “companions of highness”. But it is used in the sense of the generality of what “we”, the Salafis, are upon, and what our Scholars are upon, in opposition to what Morgan and his likes are upon. This is to show Morgan that our methodology is different to his. It is to show him that the voice speaking with him is the collective voice of those upon the Methodology of the Prophets in calling to Allaah, the Methodology of Imaam Maalik, the methodology of intellect and wisdom. It is to show him that it is the collective voice of those who adhered to the clarifications of the Inheritors of the Prophets, the Imaams of Guidance in the current times, Imaam Ibn Baaz, Imaam al-Albaani, Shaikh Ibn Uthameen as opposed to those who took to the newly-arisen foolish-minded ones. It was for this reason that we prefer to use the pronoun “we” not because of any claim to royalty(!). Anyhow, maybe we can say this is just semantics.

**Secondly**, his claim that we are blind followers, because of our saying “we took from our Scholars because they took from the sources”. Morgan claimed this to be the “classical taqleedi quote”. Of course, it is from the methodology of those who are poisoned with the ideology and way of thinking of the neo-Qutubites, Partisans and Activists to accuse those who do not agree with them and their views of being blind-followers, because in their view, knowledge is not contained in the narrations, but what their chests contain and what the whisperings of their minds inspire them with.

When we say we took from the Scholars because they took from the sources, then that means “they brought the evidences”. Let us practically illustrate. What were the issues of contention? The issue of the multiplicity of groups and parties, is it permissible or not. The

issue of co-operating with the groups of innovation. The issue of membership to parties and groups. The issue of political work in the current times. The issues of takfir and haakimiyyah in general. The issue of the takfir of the sinners, making takfir of the rulers in absolute terms. The issue of how to advise the sinful rulers, having patience with them. The issue of rebelling against them. The issue of refuting the innovators and warning against them and their books. The issue of how to rectify the Ummah. The issue of al-Muwaazanah, the wicked bid'ah of the Qutubites. The issue of Sayyid Qutb and his heresies and so on. This is by way of example only. These are the issues about which Imaam al-Albaani said, in his famous statement on "the Khawaarij of the Era", that "they have opposed many of the issues of the methodology of the Salaf".

So our scholars wrote and authored in this regard, drawing upon the clear, manifest and apparent teachings of the Book, the Sunnah and the way of the Salaf in all of that, and they affirmed the truth concerning these issues. And when we saw that the truth was with them, since they had drawn from dictates and doctrines in the Book and the Sunnah, not the dictates of Qutb, Suroor and Bannaa, so when we saw and researched all that, we knew the truth was with them, for they had indeed taken from the sources. So we stuck to them and adhered to their way, for their way was but the way of the Salaf before them. All of this enraged the partisans, and so they accused us of blameworthy taqleed. But never were they able to engage in knowledge-based discussions on these issues – for they had been foiled, walhamdulillaah. Salman al-Awdah attempted to make an Imaam of Misguidance into an Imaam of Guidance, and the Ibn Ma'een of the Era<sup>39</sup> exposed his scandal. Safar al-Hawaali tried to propound the theory of the Mansoori Khaarijites and attempted to bring down Imaam al-Albaani with his accusation of Irjaa, but his scandal was laid bare, alongside his being exposed for making takfir of the sinners, generalised and unrestricted takfir of the rulers and other matters. Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq innovated Hizbiyyah into the religion of our Lord and innovated the democracy of the Infidels into the religion, and he was exposed and disgraced by the Ibn Ma'een of the Era. Yet all of these scandals were justified by the partisans in the name of "Ijtihad" and "the Fiqh of Priorities"(!).

**Thirdly**, his insistence that we repent from having slandered those who have been the subject of our discussion. If we slandered anyone then we repent from that in front of Allaah. It really depends what Morgan considers to be a slander. If it means to highlight someone's ideology, explain its foundations and its origins and its similarities with more extreme versions of the same ideology, and then to warn from all of that – using the words of the Ulamaa, those who used terms like "Khawaarij of the Era" and so on. Then if this is what Morgan considers to be a slander, then we do not repent from the likes of this, since this is not a slander. Rather, it is fulfilling the objective of the Sharee'ah of firstly, warning the Muslims from pending danger that misguides and causes destruction and secondly, lessening the burden and sin of those who propagate destructive ideas to the youth. However, if he means by slander to say something about someone that is not the truth, then we repent to Allaah for everything that falls into this type, whether we know it

---

<sup>39</sup> That is Shaikh Rabee' bin Haadee who was called "the Ibn Ma'een of the Era" by Shaikh Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhaab al-Bannaa, a veteran Salafi scholar of around 80 years of age, who sixty years ago met one of the most famous muhaddiths of the last century, al-Mu'allimee al-Yamaani, in the Haram.

or do not know of it, whether we realise it or do not realise it, whether it happened in the past, or if it may happen in the future – and we seek refuge in Allaah from that it should happen.

**Fourthly**, his clearing himself of any attachment to Sayyid Qutb and his works and from the Khawaarij and so on. One need not have read Sayyid Qutb to be affected by his thought and ideology. We say that the overwhelming majority of the groups present today who are engrossed in takfir and rebellion and so on, then the source and spring of all of them return to the works and writings of Sayyid Qutb. So one may not have read Sayyid Qutb, but he will have read Muhammad Suroor or Muhammad Qutb or Safaral-Hawali, or Salman al-Awdah. Their way is but the way of Sayyid Qutb, albeit coupled with hizbiyyah and other ideological elements they have added themselves. Regardless of how one becomes affected by this way of thinking, either by mixing with the wrong people, or reading the books of those affected by this way, the source, root and spring, always goes back to Sayyid Qutb – the main theoretician, and figurehead for the Khawaarij of the twentieth century.

### **Beware of The Warm-Fuzzy Thing**

It is important that we close with some very good advice, which surprisingly, was given by Morgan himself, in his small article, “On Style And Content, an Observation”.

He states, “A problem I am seeing a lot of these days among American and America-influenced Muslims (most of the rest of them) is that like the underlying Christian culture, people pay way too much attention to warm-fuzzies and how things feel. He’s such a NICE and KIND man and he loves everyone (therefore: his program MUST be the truth). Spoken by a devoted follower of Hisham Kabbani. He might as well be a Christian – they’ve got the **warm-fuzzy thing** DOWN...”

...A Muslim must learn to take the truth from the two sources and only accept it from other sources who can back themselves up from those two sources. Good and inviting character is a wonderful thing when Allah blesses someone with it, but anyone who is incapable of spotting Allah's truth even if on the tongue of a rough, rude and ego-infected speaker and who accepts falsehood as long as it is presented by a sweet, soft-spoken, “I-love-everyone” guy is surely doomed. Perhaps this is one of the most important messages which needs to be understood and taught at this time.”

Indeed, Morgan has given good advice, and we pray that he is able to adhere to it himself. For it is not the case that everyone who has a sweet, soft-spoken voice and a good and inviting character is upon manifest truth. Sometimes the truth can emerge from the tongue of a rough, rude and even ego-infected speaker.

Someone may come along and say there is “manifest” goodness in the groups and parties and try to accommodate all the people of innovation – which indeed sounds pleasing and inviting to many – but the one who cannot see that and is incapable of spotting the truth of Allaah on the tongues of the truthful ones, even though they may have rough, crude

and harsh behaviour, is surely doomed. We pray to Allaah that he allows those put to trial from Ahl us-Sunnah to see through the apparent shallowness of the calls of the Political Activists, which are but founded in emotionalism, sentiment, and mere appeal to the masses, and that He allows them to see truth as truth and falsehood and falsehood and that He saves them from being infected with what Morgan has described as “the warm-fuzzy thing”.

And we also pray to Allaah that He makes us speak the truth in all situations and circumstances, without fearing any reproach of the blamers. And we also ask him that in addition to speaking the truth he bestows us with good and inviting characters. Ameen.

## Important Lessons for Every Salafi, Athari

In light of all that has preceded above, it is necessary for us to draw some important lessons, such that it adds firmness to our steadfastness to the manhaj of the Salaf, and so that it repels the ramblings of Ahl ul-Ahwaa.

**Firstly:** It is necessary for Ahl us-Sunnah to take to learning and to taking their deen seriously. For the very first calamity to befall one who claims Sunnah and Salafiyyah is the lack of zeal and desire for seeking knowledge, travelling to the people of knowledge, acquiring books, tapes, reading the Qur'an, the Sunnah and the books of the Salaf. The cure to every doubt is knowledge. A sign of a person's "repentance" to Salafiyyah is that he displays his sincerity by his seeking of knowledge.

**Secondly:** There are many usool (foundations) in Islaam, the first of which is no doubt Tawheed. However, there are many other usool as well, which have unfortunately been neglected. For example, making sure one seeks knowledge, especially on issues of creed and manhaj, from a Person of the Sunnah, knowing the strengths and weaknesses of individuals and callers, avoiding people who are not upon clarity and a straight way. A person might have good manners but he is affected by Qutubism. So don't be deceived by his good behaviour and don't advance him merely on account of his good manners, while he is affected by a dangerous ideology. Our Salaf warned from that. The point here is that we ought to acquire all of the Sunnah and implement all of the Sunnah. We do not differentiate between aqidah and manhaj. To us, there is only thing. The Sunnah. All of the Sunnah is our aqidah and manhaj. This is why Imaam Ahmad said in Usool us-Sunnah, **"And from the binding and necessary Sunnah are the [sum-total] of those things which if a person leaves only a single one of them, he will not be a believer in it (the Sunnah), nor will he be accepting (the whole of it) and nor will he be of its people"**. And then he discusses many issues thereafter, those that are related to creed, those that are related to manhaj. So this is our way. We wish to be persons of the Sunnah in the complete sense. For this reason we learn, know and act upon all of the usool (foundations). We must not become deceived and think that Uloohiyyah and Asmaa was-Sifaat is what Salafiyyah is all about. It's not. Understand the saying of Imaam al-Albaani on those who wish to differentiate between aqidah and manhaj<sup>40</sup>. That is indeed a very great and wise

---

### <sup>40</sup> A SOUND AND CORRECT MANHAJ IS THE WAY TO SAFETY FROM FIRE

Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan was asked: "Is [entry into] Paradise and Hellfire **dependent upon the correctness of one's Manhaj** (methodology)?"

His reply: **"Yes. When a person's manhaj is correct he will be in Paradise. So if he is upon the manhaj of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and the manhaj of the Salaf us-Saalih, he will become one of the inhabitants of Paradise by Allaah's permission. And when he travels upon the manhaj of the misguided strayers, he is threatened with the Hellfire."** (Al-Ajwibah al-Mufidah p.77)

Imaam al-Albaani was asked, "Some of the youth differentiate between the aqidah of the Salaf and the manhaj of the Salaf so you see some of them upon the aqidah of the Salaf yet they allow themselves to work with some of the methodologies that exist today, even though there maybe what opposes the manhaj of the

saying. So understand this point well. There are many usool (foundations) of the Sunnah. We want to be with those who are upon it clearly and manifestly, internally and externally, upon the greater part of it and the smaller part of, in all of the affairs. We want to learn from them and take from them. As for those who are not like that, then we do not make them referent points, for we do not like confusion and its people, we only like clarity and those upon it.

**Thirdly:** It is necessary for Salafis to understand well the concept of al-Walaa wal-Baraa in Islaam. It has different levels. It first begins with the Kuffar. We make baraa' (disownment) of them in absolute terms and our walaa is for the people of Islaam. Then within Islaam, we make baraa' of the Innovators and the groups and parties of Innovation, those upon Shirk and Innovation and Deviation in Allaah's Names and Attributes. We make sure that our baraa' is based upon Tawheed and Aqidah. Then we make baraa' based on adherence to the manhaj and to the foundations of the Sunnah. Our total walaa' is for the people of the Sunnah, its scholars, students of knowledge and followers. Those who are upon the sound aqidah and manhaj, internally and externally. This is the Saved Sect, the Aided Group, and their signs and characteristics are amply described in the Sunnah and the words of the early Salaf and their way is manifestly clear. Then within this group we make baraa' of the sinners and disobedience ones, such that we befriend the pious friends of Allaah and make them our company.

---

Salaf within them in terms of practice. So is there a binding link between the aqidah and manhaj of the Salaf in the practical implementation of the Salafi manhaj?"

The Shaikh replied – in powerful and revealing words: "That which I believe and worship Allaah with is that there are both generalities (in similarity) and specific (aspects) between the Salafi manhaj and aqidah. Aqidah is more specific than manhaj as all of you know. Aqidah has a link with what is called – in the view of many of the Jurists – the "knowledge of tawhid", and this is the chief and fundamental aspect of Islaam. However, manhaj is more vast than aqidah or tawhid. As for those who claim that the differentiation that has come in this question (between aqidah and manhaj), **then they desire by this to make it permissible for themselves to adopt ways and means in their daw'ah to Islaam which the Salaf us-Salih were not upon.** To say this in a different way, they consider that they have the liberty to adopt whatever ways and means they think will help them to convey (and actualise) Islaam, and you are aware of the examples of this type or these types of means.

**For example, open demonstrations and rallies in order to force the rulers to turn their attention to what the society complains about and similar matters.** So we say that what has come in the Book and the Sunnah and what the Salaf us-Salih were upon with respect to objectives, goals and ways and means are sufficient for the Ummah. **However, the reason which leads some of the people to permit themselves to adopt these ways and means, in fact it is correct for me to say that they permit themselves to blindly-follow the disbelievers in the ways that they have adopted in order to actualise what they call either democracy or social justice and other such words which have no reality to them.** So they – I mean these Muslims – permit themselves to blindly follow the disbelievers in these ways and means.

We say, our Lord, the Mighty and Majestic has made removed us from having any need, by our Shari'ah, of this separation which has been explained (i.e. between aqidah and manhaj) and that we should be needy of the disbelievers and that we should take from their ways and means, which might be good for them, (but) only because they have no Shari'ah by which they guide themselves. It is for this reason that we say that manhaj is more vast than aqidah and tawhid, **hence it is necessary to adhere to what the Salaf us-Salih were upon with respect to both these affairs; the one that is vast (manhaj) first and foremost** and the one that is more narrow (tawhid), meaning aqidah." (Al-Asaalah Magazine, Vol 22).

This is how a Sunni, Salafi, Athari makes his *walaa'* and *baraa'*. We do not make our *walaa'* on good manners as a starting point. This is not in belittlement of good manners, for good manners are indeed weighty on the scales. But the People of Innovation have pious people, who on account of their piety, mislead others<sup>41</sup>. Our starting point is soundness of creed and *manhaj*. And our love and hate is based upon that. We love everyone to the extent of what is with them of Tawheed and the Sunnah and the correct *manhaj*, and we dislike them to the extent to which they are far from it. Our loving and hating is for Allaah's sake. Not because so and so is a friend or he is my next-door neighbour, or he this or that.

Perhaps one with the affectations of Qutubism may interject here and say, "then what about the wicked and "apostate" rulers, where is your *baraa'* from them?". Then we reply, that the sinful, tyrant rulers are not excluded from our *walaa'* and *baraa'*. For we hate them based upon the same principles above and to the extent of their sinfulness, oppression, and deviation in *aqidah* and Tawhid and so on, we hate them with our hearts. However, our behaviour with them is tied to the concepts of Sunnah and Salafiyyah and not those of Bid'ah and Qutubiyyah. So though we hate what is with them for the sake of Allaah, we let the Sunnah dictate this hate. It is not a requirement of our *baraa'* and our hatred for the sake of Allaah that we begin to cause commotion and civil strife and incite the people against them, leading to the calamities that have occurred in the Muslim lands in which the real suffering and damage has been done to the Islamic da'wah and where the real destruction has been in terms of all those killed because the Khawaarij of our times rushed to their Qutubiyyah and so they were left to their Qutubiyyah.<sup>42</sup> No. Our way is the way of

---

<sup>41</sup> Yunus bin Ubaid said to his son, "I forbid you from fornication (*zinaa*), stealing and drinking wine. However that you meet Allaah with any of these sins is better to me than that you meet him with the view of Amr bin Ubaid and the associates of Amr (i.e. the Mu'tazilah)." (al-Ibaanah 2/466).

Sa'eed bin Jubair said, "That my son accompanies a sinful and cunning scoundrel who is a Sunni is more beloved to me than that he accompanies a devoutful and worshipful Innovator." (al-Ibaanah no. 89).

Imaam Al-Barbahaaree said, "However, if you see a person whose manner and opinion is despicable, he is wicked, sinful and oppressive, yet he is a person of the Sunnah, accompany him and sit with him, since his sin will not harm you. **If you see a man who strives hard and long in worship, is abstemious, being continual in worship, except that he is a person of innovation, do not sit with him, do not listen to his words and do not walk along with him, since I do not feel safe that you will not eventually come to be pleased with his way and go to destruction along with him.**" (Sharh us-Sunnah no. 149).

Imaam Ahmad said, "The graves of Ahl us-Sunnah from those who committed the major sins are like gardens. And the graves of Ahl ul-Bid'ah from amongst their abstemious pious ones are hollow and empty. The sinners of Ahl us-Sunnah are the Awliyaa' (Friends) of Allaah and the abstemious pious ones of Ahl ul-Bid'ah are the Enemies of Allaah." (Tabaqaat ul-Hanaabilah 1/184).

<sup>42</sup> Ibn Sa'd relates in his Tabaqaat al-Kubraa (7/163-165), "A group of Muslims came to al-Hasan al-Basree seeking a verdict to rebel against al-Hajjaaj [a tyrannical and despotic ruler]. So they said, "O Abu Sa'eed! What do you say about fighting this oppressor who has unlawfully spilt blood and unlawfully taken wealth and did this and that?" So al-Hasan said, "I hold that he should not be fought. If this is a punishment from Allaah, then you will not be able to remove it with your swords. If this is a trial from Allaah, then be patient until Allaah's judgement comes, and He is the best of judges." So they left al-Hasan, disagreed with him and



the Sunnah. So if we do not see clear manifest kufr from them, then we behave with them as the Sunnah and the way of the Salaf requires. When we see clear manifest kufr, having a clear proof from Allaah, then we return to the Senior and Erudite Imaams for the judgement of takfir and seek their advice and direction. And concerning this, the saying of Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen that has preceded in this regard is what we hold, that even where we see clear and manifest kufr, then what benefit will be brought about by causing agitation and declaring this in front of all of the people, except the causing of further tribulation, repression and calamities.

These are very sensitive affairs, and so they should be left to the likes of our Senior Imaams and Mashaayikh, not the likes of Morgan. If Morgan thinks this is defeatism and that he himself is indeed a brave and courageous one, then let him buy his ticket to travel to any of these Muslim lands where there is tyranny and oppression, let him buy his loudspeaker, stand outside the residence of the one in authority and proclaim what he is only so bold of proclaiming while sitting thousands of miles away, living under the societal structure, the protection and the welfare granted by the Infidels. Let him do that and let him see the benefits of his ways and let us see what further good he brings about for the Muslims of that country. Words are easy Morgan. We could just as easily vent our anger and make an open proclamation of our hating for the sake of Allaah, but we fear that we might fall into riyaa' O Morgan. We pray to Allaah that he gives us the chance to become the best of martyrs, those who say a truthful word **in the face** of a tyrannical ruler so that we are then slain as martyrs inshaa'llaah. This is what we hope in. We do not like mere show and venting of anger in front of the people, which we consider to be riyaa'. We detest that and despise that. And we pray to Allaah that he saves us from the riyaa' of many of those poisoned with the Qutubite doctrine, the cowardly ones, whose condition has been explained elsewhere. O Allaah, we seek refuge in you from riyaa' (showing off) and seeking to be heard of.

**Fourthly:** It is necessary for us to purify our souls and our characters and manners from the various blemishes and shortcomings. As we know the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) was sent to perfect the manners and characteristics of people. So in addition to correcting our deen, our aqidah, our manhaj and our ibaadah, we also correct our akhlaaq. The Ahl ul-Ahwaa always seek to argue against our creed and manhaj by using the argument of bad manners. Don't let this affect you. They have not been able to bring proofs for their innovated manhaj, so this is the only way they can establish it. So don't fall for this. This is what they always use. Fine, say to them "OK my manners are bad and inshaa'llaah I am resolved to improve. Now let's discuss the actual issues". Or say to them, "May Allaah have mercy upon you for directing me to my faults. Inshaa'llaah I will correct them. Now let us get back to the actual issues". The Ahl ul-Ahwaa do not like this, for they are people with no sound argument. They say that the issues of contention are issues of

---

rebelled against al-Hajjaaj – so al-Hajjaaj killed them all. Al-Hasan used to say, "If the people had patience when they are being tested by their unjust ruler, it will not be long before Allaah will give them a way out. However, they always rush for their swords, so they are left with their swords. By Allaah! Not even for a single day did they bring about any good."

ijtihaad and you are bad-mannered and foul-mouthed. Go and learn something more important. This is what they say.

But then, like Morgan, they vehemently defend what they are upon of deviated ways of thinking, and in the process show wicked and evil manners and make mockery and sarcasm of you, showing two standards. One for them and one for us. Why do this, when these are issues of ijtihaad to you, and then you become enraged when others consider your way to be wrong, because they are not issues of ijtihaad in their view.

Sometimes zeal, anger and love for the truth, makes us behave irrationally and improperly. But we don't let Ahl ul-Ahwaa use this sophistry and this devious mode of argumentation against us. For they are the ones who preach piety to others and don't practise it themselves. Don't you see how they accuse those who disgraced them and their innovatory methodologies, the likes of Shaikh Ibn Rabee' bin Haadee of being "harsh", "unjust" and having "bad manners" and so on. This is their way, they cannot reply so they resort to this type of behaviour. Don't you see how Morgan preached piety and thereafter fell into the very same that he accused us of. Yet we merely showed similarities in the origin and details of the doctrine and methodology of two groups of people, at-Takfir wal-Hijrah on the one hand and the likes of Safar and Salman on the other, and this is what enraged him. Then he preached piety to us to repent from this "slander" – which was not a slander anyway, it was the truth(!). Then afterwards, he, in his own elusive way and particular style of writing makes mockery of our scholars and makes sarcasms and either insinuates or explicitly states that we are "spies", "true takfeeris", and that we should go to our "awliyaa al-umoor". They claim that this is what we believe about the rulers. That the rulers are extremely pious, walis of Allaah!! So they have two faces. They enjoin piety, and describe it in such a way as if they themselves are an embodiment of it. Then they expose their two-faced foolishness by displaying wicked manners and wicked ways of arguing and abusing and revilement.

This is also the way they attempt to discredit the teachings of our scholars. So for example when you say, "These are the views of al-Albaani and Muqbil and Ibn Baaz" and I follow them, then they say, "Al-Albaani, Muqbil and Ibn Baaz are free and innocent of you and your wicked slanders and manners. They are free of you and your way". This is what they say in return. So what they do is they either use your bad manners in order to divert the people's attention from the actual issues. They themselves have nothing from the senior scholars to support their innovated methodologies. So to avoid resorting to the words and clarifications of the senior scholars, they use this type of argumentation. This is why Morgan never once ventured into the actual issues. But he used tactics like these.

Fine, we sometimes have bad manners, then may Allaah reward you O Ahl ul-Ahwaa, may Allaah have mercy upon you for directing us to this. Now let us get back to the point and discuss why your aqidah is incorrect, or why you manhaj is incorrect, or why you harbour the ideas of Qutubiyyah and Surooriyyah, and why do you defend and praise the Innovators. These are more serious issues than our manners. We know where we need to improve ourselves. Yet you think you are upon guidance in your misguidance. So baraakallaahu feekum.

And then we also say to them that there were many amongst the most knowledgeable of the Salaf, nay Muhadditheen, who had evil manners. Yet that did not mean that they were upon deviation and misguidance. Al-Khateeb al-Baghdaadee said about al-A'mash, "Al-'Amash was of evil manners, he had a very crude, harsh nature... and the reports of the people of knowledge in this regard are famous..". Then he mentions ten or so narrations to illustrate the way al-A'mash used to abuse and revile others from the people of hadeeth, merely out of bad manners. Then al-Khateeb al-Baghdaadee said, "And the narrations concerning al-A'mash which give this meaning are very many indeed. Yet alongside his evil manners, he was thiqah (trustworthy, reliable) in his hadeeth, just and straight in his narrating, exact and precise in his hearing, precise and exact in what he had memorised. As a result people travelled to him..." (Tahdheeb Sharaf As-haabul-Hadeeth, pp. 129-131).

We also remind them of the way of many of our Salaf in dealing with those who fell into the likes of what Safar and Salman and Abdur-Rahmaan Abdul-Khaaliq fell into. Abu Abdullaah Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Mufarraj said, "Abu Ja'far Ahmad bin Awn illaah (d. 378H) would show rejection against the People and Innovation and call them to account, showing extreme harshness against them, utterly humiliating them, always seek to pick out their faults, rushing to damage them, vehemently oppressive against them, chasing them away whenever he was able to, not allowing them to remain. And every one of them (Ahl ul-Bid'ah) used to be frightened of him, and would seek to hide and protect himself from him. He would never compromise with a single one of them, and nor would he allow any of them to remain safe. And if he came across evil and witnessed any deviation from the Sunnah, he would oppose it and would disgrace and humiliate (its perpetrator), and he would announce the affair of this person and declare his own disownment of him by mentioning the evil of such a one in the various public gatherings, and he would incite others against him such that he either destroyed him or caused him to abandon his evil and repugnant madhhab and his evil doctrine. And he would never cease to remain upon this habit, making Jihaad therein, seeking the Face of Allaah, up until he met Allaah." (Taareekh Dimashq 5/118). And he is the Muhaddith, Imaam, Ahmad bin Awn illaah bin Hudair Abu Ja'far al-Andalusee al-Qurtubee (d. 378H).

So therefore O Sunni, let not the Ahl ul-Ahwaa beguile you in all of this. They are merely infected with the **"warm-fuzzy thing"**, so do not let them beguile you. And at the same time improve your manners and attend to your own soul, for that only adds perfection to what you are already upon of following the Sunnah and loving its people and restraining and humiliating Bid'ah and its people – inshaa'llaah.

**Fifthly:** We judge people by their company and look and see who they are mixing with, which books are they reading, who do they speak with, whose ideas do they promote, who are their true scholars and actual points of reference and whose platforms do they sit on. This is a point of methodology which the Innovators hate and detest. It enrages them, fills them with anger, gives them sleepless nights and lasting headaches. They swoon with their mere knowledge of this, that the Salafis, Atharis, As-haabul-Athar follow in the way of

those before them in this methodology – which is but embodied in the saying of Muhammad bin Seereen “Name us your men”.

Yahyaa bin Katheer said, “Sulaimaan bin Daawood – alaihis salaam – said: Do not pass a judgement over anyone with anything until you see whom he befriends.” Al-Ibaanah (2/464). Moosaa bin Uqbah the Syrian approached Baghdad and this was mentioned to Imaam Ahmad. So it was said, “Look at whose residence he goes to and with whom he resides and finds shelter.” Al-Ibaanah (2/480). Imaam Al-Awzaa’ee said, “Whoever hides his innovation from us will not be able to hide his companionship from us.” Al-Ibaanah (2/476)

Al-A’mash said, **“They (the Salaf) did not used to ask anything more about a person after having asked about three affairs:** Who he walks with, who he enters upon (i.e. visits) and who he associates with amongst the people.” Al-Ibaanah (2/478). Muhammad bin Ubaid al-Ghulaabee said, “The Ahl ul-Ahwaa (People of Desires) hide everything except their intimate friendship and companionship.” Al-Ibaanah (2/482). Mu’aadh bin Mu’aadh said to Yahyaa bin Sa’eed, “O Abu Sa’eed! A person may hide his viewpoint from us, but he will not be able to hide that in his son, or his friend or in the one whom he sits with.” Al-Ibaanah (2/437).

So when we realise the connection of al-Awdah with Muhammad Suroor and with Muhammad al-Mis’ari, we know what is going on. When we see the studentship of al-Hawali under Muhammad Qutb, then we come to understand the realities. When we see them promoting the books, nay the doctrines of Sayyid Qutb, we come to know the realities. When we see them attacking the Imaam and Muhaddith, al-Albaani, accusing him of Irjaa’, we gain baseerah (insight) about their agenda and plot. When we see the reference points and sources of IANA and al-Muntadaa, the individuals therein, their connections and so on, then we know what ideology they are upon and that which they promote. When we see individuals having spent months with al-Muntadaa, then subsequently propounding the doctrines of takfir and khurooj (such as what occurred in Malmo, Sweden), then we surely know the affairs. When we see Ar’oor teaching manhaj from the books of Sayyid Qutb, of course, there is no need to say any more. When we see Ahmad Sallaam becoming angry only for the sake of Adnaan Ar’oor and Muhammad Qutb, then what more does he need to do to reveal his orientation? And so on...

All of this enrages the biased partisans and sets their undergarments ablaze.

Imaam ash-Shaatibee states in al-I’tisaam, “And Ibn Battaal quotes in his ‘Sharh ul-Bukhaaree’ from Abu Haneefah that he said: “I met ‘Ataa ibn Rabaah in Makkah and I asked him about something and he said: ‘From which place are you?’ I said: ‘Kufah’. He said: ‘Are you from the town [whose inhabitants] split their religion and break into sects?’ I said: ‘Yes’. He said: ‘From which group are you?’ I said: ‘From those who do not revile and abuse the Salaf (Pious Predecessors), who have faith in Qadr and who do not declare anyone to be a disbeliever on account a sin [that he committed].’ So ‘Ataa said: ‘You know [the truth] so hold fast’.”

It enrages the Qutubites when we make our position clear and when we say, "We are not of those who praise and aggrandise the Innovators, nor do we make unrestricted and absolute takfir, nor are we those who make takfir of the sinners, or those who call to khurooj, either in theory or in practice." It makes them furious when we, like Abu Haneefah did in the narration above, free ourselves from Innovation (and its people). They cannot take it when the Salafis try to make that distinguishing line exactly what it was before the fitnah started, that is make it manifestly clear and apparent. It also stirs them with hatred when we ask them "From which group are you? From those who accuse al-Albaani of Irjaa' or of those who accuse Shaikh Rabee of being a spy and agent or those who accuse the ones who do not show open rejection against the Rulers of being agents and compromisers." This enrages them. They hate that we should follow in the path of the Salaf in seeking clarity from them.

Die in your rage O Ahl ul-Ahwaa. Perish in your madness. Wander in your misguided warm-fuzzies.

**Sixthly:** It is also important for the Salafis, Atharis to be aware that there are some who claim Sunnah and Salafiyyah but are ignorant of its truths and its manhaj. And so they, in their ignorance and claim to leadership wish to be the rectifiers and so they co-operate with some who are confused and mixed-up with ideas of Qutubiyyah and Surooriyyah. So they claim that they can change the affairs, and take a "middle-way" and that they can take to their platforms and co-operate with them, because "they know the score". And this only leads to further confusion, not clarity. This is because Ahl ul-Ahwaa and those poisoned with the ideals of Qutubism and Suroorism use this against Ahl us-Sunnah and they attempt to promote their way and their doctrine by it. They say so and so gave a talk for us, or so and so was at our centre and so on. Or sometimes they organise talks and invite one of our Scholars, the Scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah at their venues, in order to deceive the common-folk. So they say, "see, such and such scholar gave a talk at our function". Then afterwards they promote their true doctrine. This is what the likes of Ihyaa at-Turaath do. Gain credibility for themselves in this manner, and then once they have got and gained the strength, they push their true doctrine.

So the point is, that there are some amongst the people who claim Sunnah and Salafiyyah, and who are in truth ignorant of its true manhaj, take the affairs into their own hands, think they are the rectifiers, and allow the Ahl ul-Ahwaa to benefit from these types of matters. The following discussion between some of the Mashaayikh and Imaam al-Albaani is perhaps pertinent here:

**Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Misri:** With regard to the matter - that sometimes a student of knowledge - who is able to give da'wah - is called to centres of the 'Ikhwaanul-Muslimeen', or of the (other) groups of hizbiyyah (partisanship) - he is called to give a lecture, either in a mosque or a gathering place - or so on. But the student of knowledge feels that if he went there he would not be able to speak about the matters about which there is disagreement between us and them, and if he speaks about the matters which they want - they will

benefit from his presence in this way, and they will be able to say - for example to the others - that we are all one and the same, and our da'wah is the same - don't you see that so and so, son of so and so gave a lecture along with us - and so on. So he fears that this will produce harmful effects. But another will say: No, if we are invited to a matter comprising obedience to Allaah - the Mighty and Majestic - and from the aspect of cooperation upon righteousness (birr) and piety (taqwaa), and avoidance of cooperation upon sin and enmity - without thinking that this may produce evil - allowing them to make use of his presence. So do you advise, O Shaikh, for example, that one writes articles in magazines which are known to have a certain orientation that is hizbee (party spirited) - even if in principle they are Salafi; or being present to give a lecture, or in a panel session or some similar matter - without speaking about the matters where there is disagreement. He will speak about general things - sharee'ah rulings and fiqh verdicts - and those who prohibit it use as evidence what you have heard, and those who allow it use as evidence what you have heard. What is correct from the sayings of the two groups?

**Imaam al-Albaani:** What is correct is that he should stipulate (set the conditions) and no stipulations be made upon him.

**Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Misri:** So if he knows from himself that he will not be able to speak out with the word of truth - whether they are pleased or not - should he still go?

**Imaam al-Albaani:** They might stipulate a certain speech for him - so if it is according to desires, then he should not agree and not go. But if they leave it up to him, then he should be the one to stipulate what he will speak about; but he should not spring something upon them - since by speaking about a matter and taking them by surprise he will cause trouble, which may be such as will prevent him continuing in what he wishes to talk about. Rather he should say: I am going to speak, for example, about Tawheed, or for an example concerning: "O you who believe! Obey Allaah and obey the Messenger.." (an-Nisa.4:59). So if they agree, then he should go ahead, and if not - then not. This is what I meant by my saying that he should stipulate and not have stipulations made upon him.

**Shaikh Ali Hasan al-Halabi:** The Shaikh (al-Albaani) gave this as an example, and in reality there may be disagreement between us with regard to both of these things - so this is what is meant in reality by the teacher (Shaikh al-Albaani).

**Shaikh Abul-Hasan al-Misri:** Meaning, (that) he should speak about the matter about which there is disagreement, but with gentleness and mildness, and with wisdom, and in such a way as will produce benefit - it is not just a case that he wishes to speak in order to increase the enmity. No. Rather he should go and speak - but if they lay down stipulations, then he should not go - and if they allow him the opportunity to speak about that which will lead one closer to Allaah, with mildness, and in a manner that he expects will correct their condition - then he should do that. May Allaah bless you.

Recorded upon a tape in the series 'Silsilatul-Hudaa wan-Noor'. (no.851/1) among the questions of Abul-Hasan Mustafaa ibn Isma'eel al-Misree put to the Scholar Shaikh al-Albaani, dated 9/7/1416H).

The problem is that these same ones who claim Sunnah and Salafiyyah, do not go there with the intention to correct their condition on the issues in which they have deviated, but they discuss other affairs, which are often chosen by the ones who are inviting them. And then perhaps this will go on for months and months – and this will lead to confusion since the ones who invite him, will then use this to conceal their deviation and subsequently allow them, at the same time, to promote it and to cause confusion amongst the Salafis. So this is the danger.

So we advise the likes of these, who are in this position or who assume this position for themselves, that when they go to the platforms of the Qutubis, Surooris and Hizbis, that they should go with the intention of correcting them and only if they the ability to do so, with the required knowledge and understanding, the Sharee'ah proofs and the sayings of the Ulamaa. In the absence of this, a person is not qualified to go and speak in front of them in the first place. So either he intends this and makes this clear to them, therefore he stipulates the conditions, or otherwise he does not attend, since they only wish to use him for their own agendas.

## **Closing Remarks**

Perhaps in what has preceded there is sufficiency for Ahl us-Sunnah to see and understand the affairs as they transpired, and for them to realise the true beginnings and origins of this fitnah which has reached every corner of the world and which has resulted in great confusion about the concepts of Sunnah and Salafiyyah – and a result of which many from Ahl us-Sunnah have been left in bewilderment and confusion, not being able to realise the truth and its people from falsehood and its people, the Sunnah from Bid'ah and the Imaams of Guidance from the Imaams of Misguidance and the Salafi Manhaj from the Qutubi, Bannaawi, Suroori, Hizbi, Turaathi Manhaj.

And perhaps the perceptive Sunni, Salafi, Athari will have realised the plots and machinations of Ahl ul-Ahwaa, their doubts and desires, the modes and mechanisms of approaching Ahl us-Sunnah, attempting to separate them from their Scholars, belittling them and causing doubts as to what they are upon of the sound Salafi Manhaj, which they (the Partisans) have all but opposed, as stated by Imaam al-Albaani about them.

We pray that he guides the Ummah to the true teachings of Ahl us-Sunnah, giving them firmness in all of that, and that He delivers them from Ahl ul-Ahwaa, the Dissenters, those who abandon the Sunnah and take to their intellects and opinions, which are but rooted in their sentimentalism, wal-Iyaadhu billaah.

May prayers and peace be upon the Final Messenger, Muhammad, upon his family, his companions and those who follow him until the establishment of the Hour.